Volume XXXIX] *April, 1934* [*Number 3*

The

American Historical Review

URBANA MEETING
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

THE Forty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Association was held in Urbana on December 27, 28, and 29.[1] The registered attendance was 452, twenty-nine more than at the Toronto meeting, a gain due, perhaps, to a greater spirit of hopefulness in the Association, in spite of a loss in membership nearly as serious as for the year preceding. The factor of exceptionally advantageous railroad rates may have been an influence. The weather man also played his part, for the crest of the cold wave which swept over Urbana on the 26th was on the way to the Atlantic seaboard by the next day when the meetings opened. Easterners, reading that the thermometer was sixteen below zero in Boston, thought themselves fortunate in having decided, for this time at all events, to join the Westward Movement.

Other societies meeting concurrently were the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies, the Agricultural History Society, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the American Society of Church History. Joint sessions with these organizations provided some of the most interesting discussions of the meeting.

A remark frequently heard when the meeting was over was "This was the best meeting I ever attended". Such a success was largely due to the efforts of the Committee on Program, of which Professor William Spence Robertson was chairman, and the Committee on Local Arrangements, Dean Albert J. Harno, chairman. It will be remembered that the program committee early decided to devote more time than usual to

[1] The Managing Editor, unable to attend the meeting, desires to thank those who left with the Chairman of the Program Committee either their papers or abstracts, or who sent accounts of various sessions at the request of Professor S. F. Bemis, and especially Professor Bemis himself who recorded his impressions of the meeting as a whole as well as of particular sessions. Upon all these various sources the report has drawn freely, often without the formality of quotation marks.

general sessions. Accordingly sessions of this type were held on the first evening, and on the second and third mornings, in addition to the session at which Dr. Charles A. Beard delivered the Presidential Address. The aim of achieving greater unity of thought was also illustrated in the management of the special sessions. On Russian history, for example, the emphasis of the four papers covering a wide sweep of time, from the Kievan princes to the Soviet republics, was upon governmental economic enterprise. For Modern European history the theme was Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs. There were also sessions on Problems of the Lincoln Administration, Foreign Interests in the Caribbean, Agriculture in the Middle West, and upon Industrialism. It should not be forgotten that the high quality of the papers presented had quite as much to do in producing an impression of a successful meeting as the happy choice of subjects or the unity of themes.

The Local Committee arranged a series of hospitalities for the occasion, an organ recital on Wednesday afternoon, and a smoker after the general session on Wednesday evening, a reception on Thursday, and a luncheon on Friday. At the luncheon an address of welcome was made by Arthur H. Daniels, acting president of the University, and a response by Evarts Boutell Greene, who was formerly head of the department of history at Urbana. There was also an exhibit of early Americana at the University library, which was intended to illustrate the address of Randolph G. Adams on Early Americana in College Libraries, scheduled for the dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

Among the general sessions that which touched the pocketbooks, and, by suggestion, the emotions of the members, had as its theme Depressions and Recoveries.[2] Of the three papers the third, After National Recovery —What? appeared upon first reading to attribute to its author, Dr. Macmahon, a prophetic rôle. This he humorously disclaimed. His task, as he defined it, was to analyze "the complex of governmental policies and measures which has the National Recovery Act as its center". Among these activities he pointed out certain tendencies already manifest prior to March 4, 1933, which also seem to mark a path out of the present maze into the further future. The present administration had not, he said, turned sharply in a new direction, but had pursued existing policies with a different tempo. Codes, for example, had been foreshadowed in the trade practice conferences of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

[2] The papers were: A Depression of the Past, by Frederick C. Dietz; The Influence of Prosperity and Depression upon Social Thought, by Harold Lasswell; and After National Recovery—What? by Arthur W. Macmahon.

Selling agreements had also received the approval of the Supreme Court in the case of the Appalachian Coal Inc., provided they did not look toward dangerous monopoly. The public had plainly become more interested in reasonable prices than in unrestricted competition. Now, with new leadership "business itself has created and thrust on government potentialities of control which, with proper coördination and the willingness to pursue indirect effects in a constantly widening circle of responsibility, may be elements of an ordered system". In dealing with the depression of the seventies Professor Dietz found the causes almost equally world-wide. They may be summed up in the fact that the power to produce had risen higher than the standard of living. It was chiefly in the marginal and submarginal farms and factories that workers were unemployed and capital was lost. Even in those days, he remarked, there were as many remedies for depression as cures for a cold. Among the consequences were a new interest in imperialism, the rapid development of organized socialism in Europe, and the introduction of paternalism, especially in Germany. The way out seems to have come through a rapid rise in the standards of living made possible by the new machinery. In discussing the social effects of prosperity and depression Professor Lasswell did not seem to find much to choose between the consequences of the one and of the other, the indulgence of impulse and extreme, even bizarre, developments of individualism during the New Era, and the frustrations of the ego, leading to mental diseases and even suicide, when panic, chaos, and stagnation closed the door to opportunity. "Sweet are the uses of adversity" has apparently ceased to be true of these moderns. Economic oscillation may also, Professor Lasswell said, become a potent factor in political change, making successive strata of the community ready to abandon earlier orthodoxies, symbols, and slogans, and seek remedies in national and even world revolution.

Another general session which seemed to invite the historians to become a Current Events discussion group was devoted to Dictators and Dictatorships.[3] For this we have to thank Herr Hitler, and more remotely Signor Mussolini, not forgetting the diminutive Dollfuss. Hispanic America is the classical land of the dictator, and Professor Rippy gave an illuminating explanation of the fundamental reasons, adding interest to his discourse by amusing pictures of certain typical heroes, who fought their way to glory and gold with sword and machete, and whose swelling breasts were decorated with rows upon rows of

[3] European Dictators and Dictatorships, by Ralph H. Lutz; Dictatorships in Hispanic America, by J. Fred Rippy; The Pattern of Dictatorship, by Max Lerner.

ribbons and medals. Professor Rippy said that the scientific study of these rulers was yet to be made. National writers were not impartial and foreigners, especially journalists, were really engaged in propaganda or in producing sensational tales. The new nations, Professor Rippy pointed out, got off on their race for national existence after a bad start, a long and ruinous struggle to rid themselves of Spanish control. Geography also was against them. The settlements were scattered and there were no good means of communication. The population was racially divided and had little preparation for self-government. The consequence was that rebellion or revolution was easy to begin. The prospect of plunder could assemble at almost any time a horde of ignorant people, with imaginations warmed by glowing phrases. This accounts for many of the upheavals of the nineteenth century. Professor Lutz pointed out the characteristics of all three European dictatorships, the organization of economic activity as a function of government, the development of a bureaucracy recruited by a spoils system, the denial of the ordinary civil rights, and the suppression of criticism facilitated by a swarm of spies. According to Dr. Lerner Fascism and Nazism are in reality instruments seized by the "dominant economic groups" "to preserve national unity and fight the threat of communism". They have even paid the traditional democratic state the compliment of taking over its techniques for managing or hoodwinking the masses. Professor Lutz treated the dictatorships as a passing phase, while Dr. Lerner thought this new interpretation of enlightened despotism might last a long time.

The general session which was devoted to the Advance of Civilization into the Middle West [4] filled the Lincoln Hall theater with a most responsive audience. The influence of the late Professor F. J. Turner's scholarship pervaded the symposium of papers. The first speaker, Dr. Benjamin F. Wright, examining the validity of the Turner thesis, argued that the test is not the institutions of the definitely frontier period, which were frequently only temporary devices, but those, local as well as state, of the time when the first constitutions were formed. From these it appears that there was virtually no originality in the West, that in form of government, separation of powers, judicial review, the character and contents of the written constitution, etc., it was the example of the states along the Atlantic that was followed. Even in the case of suffrage qualifications Western constitution makers were following the example

[4] An Examination of the Turner Thesis, by Benjamin F. Wright, jr.; The Settling of the Middle West, by Avery O. Craven; The Development of Civilization in the Middle West, by John D. Hicks.

of the more advanced Eastern states. The second paper, by Professor Craven, treated the settlement of the Mississippi country, and by skillful division into topographical zones traced the infiltration of the several streams of settlers, from the Old South and Kentucky, from New England, and from Europe. With a refinement and precision of detail, he pursued the original lines of investigation marked out by Professor Turner's more general indications, whether made in his writings or given to the students of his seminars. A profound study of the whole question was offered by Professor John D. Hicks in analyzing the development of the Middle West from 1865 to 1900. Professor Hicks remarked that the Turner contentions are especially applicable to the period which preceded the advance of the industrial revolution upon America. The notion that the Middle West had to be civilized by conscious culture carriers from the East is absurd. The striking changes, however, which accompanied the beginning of the industrial era have not yet received adequate attention from the Western school of historians. Because of the new and easy means of communication the West was opened to outside influences more freely than ever before; as freely indeed as the East itself. Professor Hicks's main contention was that acted upon equally by the new forces there emerged a new West and a new East, differing in some particulars, strangely alike in others, interdependent and complementary, neither to be regarded as the product of the other, both essential parts of an essentially new nation. He also said that the frontier pattern of thought was never wholly shattered by the impact of the industrial revolution, and some of the frontier ideals were reënforced rather than reversed in the new age. The pioneer's willingness to accept innovations formed a social inheritance that the Middle West found it difficult to forget.

The general session at which Dr. Charles A. Beard delivered the Presidential Address upon Written History as an Act of Faith was anticipated with the keenest interest. Those who were not fortunate enough to hear this address have read it in the January number of the *Review*. With deft but telling strokes Dr. Beard overthrew one after the other the altars of false historical gods, the altar of scientific objectivity, of chains of causation, after the method of physics, of cultural organisms, rising, growing, and declining, after the method of biology, and lastly, of historical relativity. Perhaps those who had worshipped at the shrine of facts as they were, or as they came to be, listened with some searchings of conscience over the futility of their own work, until reassured by the speaker, who declared that "During the past fifty years historical scholar-

ship, carried on with judicial calm, has wrought achievements of value beyond calculation". But he insisted that every true historian must have a "frame of reference" or a philosophy of life, and that his act of faith is to face boldly the issues set by the radically differing interpretations of historical actuality, "aware of the intellectual and moral perils in any decision".

Several of the special sessions also dealt with questions of deep current import. The troubles in Cuba emphasize the problem of Foreign Interests in the Caribbean.[5] The closing paper, by a member of the faculty of the University of Havana, and a former Guggenheim fellow, Señor Vilá, was an arraignment of the Cuban policy of the United States. Cuba, he said, although older by a century than its huge continental neighbor, was kept in a state of "arrested development" because of the heavy hand of financial and economic exploitation and of political restriction. At present it is the Platt Amendment which hinders healthful growth. This deprived the Cubans of the independence piously promised by the Teller Resolution. The more recent "hands-off policy" during the Machado régime, he characterized as a clever invention, which was virtually "intervention by *abstention*". Professor Jenks expressed the opinion that the dominant position which large corporations of American origin had attained, not only in the sugar industry, but also in banks, public utilities, and transportation, had tended to thwart normal processes of development and had resulted in a complete collapse of the major enterprises themselves. Turning especially to the other states of the Caribbean area, Professor Jones described two types of financial control, by treaty with the United States and by arrangement with the leading bankers. For almost two decades prior to 1930, he explained, public finances improved and the list of defaulting states was reduced to the vanishing point. Certain of the "controls" which acted with caution during the easy money period had enabled weak states to carry on during the depression a debt service which contrasted favorably with that of other Latin states supposedly strong. Professor Dana G. Munro, who bears a name held in honor by the Association, was also a speaker during this session. His fourteen years of experience in the Department of State in dealing with the Caribbean, both at home and in the field, gave weight to a wholesome and refreshing paper on American invest-

[5] Key Industries and Foreign Investments in the Caribbean, by Leland H. Jenks; Foreign Loan Controls in the Caribbean, by Chester Lloyd Jones; American Investments and American Policy in the Caribbean, by Dana G. Munro; The United States and Cuba, by Herminio Portell Vilá.

ments and American policy in the Caribbean, showing that these investments had followed rather than preceded the flag. Interventions, with the exception of that in Cuba, had occurred in countries where the United States had the least financial interest. The aim had been to create stability in an area exposed to foreign aggression especially before the World War had weakened certain imperialistic European powers.

Closely connected with the Caribbean problem is the larger question of the Monroe Doctrine, the principal topic discussed in the session on the Diplomatic History of the United States.[6] Professor Thomas presented a severe critique of the *Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine,* prepared in 1930 by J. Reuben Clark, undersecretary of state. He felt that it was inexcusably incomplete, lacking especially any adequate explanation of the point of view of leading South American states. In the discussion it was suggested that the principal purpose of the memorandum was not historical completeness; it was rather an attempt to prune away the Roosevelt corollary, something which every administration since Roosevelt had been trying to get rid of. This corollary more than any one thing had confused thought about the Monroe Doctrine in the United States and everywhere else. Professor Thomas did not believe that the memorandum had lessened the bewilderment. The most notable intervention in Spanish American affairs was the war in 1898. Professor Pratt brought out the interesting fact, based upon the study of a wide variety of financial and trade journals, resolutions of chambers of commerce and boards of trade, together with correspondence of business men with the Department of State, that American business men were at first opposed to the war and averse to the acquisition of colonies. They thought that war would seriously retard recovery from depression which followed the panic of 1893. The threatened partition of China, however, coming also in 1898, with the news of Dewey's victory in Manila Bay, led them to feel that it would be well to have a point of support in the Philippine Islands for a share in the trade of the Far East. Before the war was over they were urging annexation both in the Caribbean and the Philippines. Years before the Spanish War, according to Professor Howe, President Arthur pushed forward a scheme of friendly trade relations with the neighboring states through a series of reciprocity treaties. This appears from the Arthur Papers to which Professor Howe

[6] The Tariff-Reciprocity Program of the Arthur Administration, by George F. Howe; The Business Man's Attitude toward the Spanish-American War and Overseas Expansion, by Julius W. Pratt; and Some Observations on the Clark Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine, by David Y. Thomas.

has had access. The plans failed through protectionist and Democratic opposition, but four years later they were taken up by Blaine, who had originally opposed them.

Another problem which has engaged many thoughtful persons as they have perceived the dangerous character of propaganda, revealed by the experiences of the World War, was presented in the session on Modern European History devoted to Public Opinion and Foreign Affairs.[7] Professor Schmitt remarked at the outset the rather mysterious phenomenon that while "public opinion calls the tune on fundamental issues, and frequently asserts itself in specific incidents, often it finds itself quite powerless to deflect a government from a course determined upon". As an example of the first he instanced the determination in France that the annexations made after the Franco-Prussian War should never receive moral recognition. The best example of the second is, perhaps, the policy of Sir Edward Grey in dealing with France and Germany from 1906 to 1914. One conclusion which Professor Schmitt expressed was of special interest. It was that such reports as Count Metternich, German ambassador in London, used to send to Berlin were actually a better guide to public opinion than were the daily outpourings of the press. Such a view was combated in the discussion, which also revealed a strong feeling that for the appraisement of public opinion in relation to foreign affairs there must be developed a special technique. This is emphasized by the interdependence of different journals as well as by the control of particular newspapers, or groups of newspapers, by interested minorities, armament manufacturers, seekers after bonuses and pensions, pacifist organizations, and the like. An illustration of the attitude of public opinion in a particular case was given by Dr. Langsam, who showed that the proposed Austro-German Customs Accord of 1931 was well received by both the American and the British press, although there was objection to the manner and the time of announcement. It was felt that the plan would lead to improved trade relations and the eventual removal of hundreds of miles of unnecessary tariff barriers. Furthermore, the decision of the World Court was generally condemned in both countries. Another illustration, this time taken from the World War, was given by Professor Duane Squires, who showed that British propaganda at home and in the United States from 1914 to 1917 was

[7] The papers were: Relations of Public Opinion to Foreign Policies in Pre-War Europe, by Bernadotte E. Schmitt; American and British Public Opinion of the Proposed Austro-German Customs Union of 1931, by Walter C. Langsam; British Propaganda at Home and in the United States, by Duane Squires.

especially skillful in grading or adapting the appeal to the susceptibilities of the various intellectual classes. He also described the leading personages engaged in this work, notably Mr. C. F. G. Masterman and Sir Gilbert Parker.

Russia is again for us near the center of the stage, and an air of contemporaneity surrounds even so historical a session as that with the subject Governmental Economic Enterprise in Russia under the Kievan Princes, the Tsars, and the Soviets.[8] The first speaker, Professor Cross, found in the principality of Kiev and its rivals the roots of many of the motives which actuate Russian economic planning to-day. At first primarily interested in export trade, they showed an "instinctive appreciation of the function of trade in a state producing only raw staples and dependent upon foreign producers not only for luxury articles but also for many types of consumers' goods". Their building of monasteries and churches, as monuments to their own greatness, but also for general use, was also evidence of an elementary sense of social values. When the earnings of trade proved insufficient, they utilized the fertile prairies of central Russia for the production of a salable surplus. Professor George Vernadsky drew a similar picture of the activities of Peter the Great, who sought to develop state and private factories to the point where they could meet governmental requirements, especially for the army. He said that by the close of the reign Russia had pig iron to export. Russia then produced as many tons as Great Britain. The discussion of the more recent phases of economic development was carried on by Professor Harper, who dealt with the constitutional era, and by Dr. Joseph Barnes, who described the Soviet plans. Dr. Harper said that a larger measure of private initiative came with the freer political conditions of the Duma period. State management of railways and a state monopoly of trade in alcoholic products were, however, retained, as were certain mining and manufacturing enterprises and extensive forest and crown lands. Dr. Barnes showed that Lenin had intended to make the transition to communism more gradual, and that it was the necessities of civil war and foreign invasion that forced what is called "Military Communism". After the period of extreme stress was over Lenin returned, through the N. E. P., to his original plan of gradual transition.

It was peculiarly appropriate that in a city where Abraham Lincoln frequently was in attendance at court proceedings the problems of his

[8] In the Kievan Period, by Samuel H. Cross; In the Times of Peter the Great, by George Vernadsky; Under the Constitutional Régime, by Samuel N. Harper; In the Period of the Civil War and Military Communism, by Joseph Barnes.

administration should be the subject of a session. The discussion centered upon his policy toward the South and slavery.[9] Dr. Paul M. Angle first explained how difficult it will remain, until the Lincoln Papers in the Library of Congress are open for study, to define his policy between the election and his inauguration. The most that can be said is that he announced a determination to hold Federal property in the South, and to maintain government services there, including the mail, if these could be carried on without sending down officials drawn from the North. He seems to have been convinced that the secession movement had no large popular backing, and felt that it would soon collapse. His aim was, therefore, to reassure the Southern people and make it clear to them that their property was in no danger from the incoming administration. Professor Cole reënforced this view by presenting evidence that Lincoln was never an emancipationist of the radical abolitionist type. The famous New Orleans incident, he urged, had commonly been misinterpreted and concerned the slave market rather than slavery. Lincoln's remedy was compensated emancipation, which he tried to put into effect in the case of Delaware as early as 1861. In the discussion Dr. Dwight L. Dumond said that while Lincoln regarded slavery as morally wrong he was aware of the difficulty of getting rid of it. The North felt no interest in compensated emancipation because such a policy would have sidetracked the issue of abolition. Compensation, moreover, would have been a partial justification of slavery. Discussing the attitude of the Whigs in several Southern states, Professor Charles S. Sydnor showed how opposed the conservative element was to secession. Their uneasiness persisted in some cases even after war began. The Emancipation Proclamation finally silenced such opposition, seeming to prove that Jefferson Davis and the radicals were correct. The consequence was the South's fundamental conception of Lincoln's emancipation policy. Incidentally, Professor Sydnor illustrated the growth of bitterness toward the North, especially in Mississippi, citing typical pronouncements of Mississippi newspapers.

The Westward Movement and the Middle West were not the theme of a general session only, they were also considered in joint sessions of the Association with the Agricultural History Society and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.[10] The larger number of the papers were

[9] Lincoln and the National Crisis before the Fall of Fort Sumter, by Paul M. Angle; Some Misconceptions concerning Lincoln's Views on Emancipation, by Arthur C. Cole.

[10] I. Sources of Southern Migration into the Old Northwest, by John D. Barnhart; Cultural Elements in the Old Northwest, by Logan Esarey; Economic Factors in the Politics of the Old Northwest, 1857–1860, by James L. Sellers; Regional Competition for the

economic in emphasis, but two touched upon the influences of migration and the development of a local culture. Professor Barnhart based his study of the Southern element in the population of the Old Northwest upon census enumerations and the names of important families. Professor Logan Esarey in order to throw definite light upon the development of culture concentrated his attention upon the river counties from Cincinnati to the mouth of the Wabash. In what he happily described as the "Golden Fifties" he discovered a diversity of talents in this region, mentioning the names and showing the importance of the contributions which were made. Turning to economic factors the papers discussed the influence of the change in transportation and invention, especially of the reaper, the organization of the cattle industry, and the consequences for political life, with the repercussions of this astonishing development upon public opinion in England. Utilizing a wealth of statistical material, Dr. Leavitt studied the history of hog, cattle, and sheep raising, as it was affected by the successive appearance of the steamboat on western rivers, the Erie and the Ohio canals, and the east and west railroads. He showed how steadily prosperous was the trade in pork products down the Mississippi to 1850. Even after the Erie Canal was built it carried only from twenty-five to fifty per cent as much pork and bacon as was exported from New Orleans for the northeastern seaboard cities. The depression which followed the panic of 1837 seems to have affected dairy prices less than other agricultural prices, due to the expansion of eastern city markets and to new markets in England. The securing of railroad connections by 1853 with the eastern seaboard and the completion of a railway network in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois by 1855, helped the prices of live stock, but stimulated still more the production of corn and wheat. In the fifties wheat production gained more rapidly than the increase in the number of farmers might indicate. It was the new channels of transportation, as Professor Thornton pointed out, which substituted the East for the South in the economic life of the Old Northwest. After 1855 the manufacture of the reaper, which was the subject of Professor Hutchinson's paper, immensely stimulated the production of wheat. This enabled the Middle West to supply England with food as English economic interest shifted from agriculture to industry. The crown of

Northwest's Supplies, by Harrison J. Thornton. II. Influence of Transportation Changes on the Development of the Live Stock Industry of the Middle West to 1860, by Charles T. Leavitt; The Reaper Industry as related to the Agricultural Development of the Middle West from 1855 to 1875, by William T. Hutchinson; Pools and Associations on the Western Cattle Ranges, by Louis Pelzer; The Reputation of Middle Western Agriculture in England, 1850–1870, by Harry J. Carman.

King Cotton was in danger. When the South took arms in his defense the reaper enabled the Northern government to send large numbers of farmers into the army without reducing wheat production. Incidentally, the English became interested observers of mid-West agriculture, and this was the subject of a paper by Professor Carman. The British, he explained, were favorably impressed with the fertility of the soil, the size of the farms, hog raising, fruit culture, and the use of machinery. On the other hand they were inclined to condemn the Westerner's failure to rotate his crops and care adequately for his live stock. They criticized also his failure to house his machinery, a trait which he has apparently transmitted to his descendants of the motor age, whether they still live on the farm or on city streets. Professor Sellers attempted to determine whether the economic factors of the situation precipitated by the panic of 1857 had affected the politics of the Old Northwest. In his study of bankruptcies, prices, business and newspaper comment, he found no conclusive evidence of such political influence. The homestead plank made a strong appeal in the region concerned, but what cast the diverse elements of the Old Northwest into the Republican organization was a compound of ideals, emotions, and interests which seem to defy analysis. The remaining paper, by Professor Louis Pelzer, dealt with a later period, and a region farther west, giving the history of pools and associations on the cattle ranges. The Wyoming Stock Growers Association, he said, which was formed in 1873, became the most powerful of such groups and furnished the model for others. Some of these associations had picturesque names: The Green Horn Association, the Smoky Hill Cattle Pool, and the Bear Paw Pool. These pools had analogues in other industries. Indeed, Professor Pelzer remarked, the cattle range pools and associations might be regarded as forerunners of the present-day corporation.

To the Old South also a session was devoted.[11] Professor Davidson presented a study of the antagonism between the back country and the coast upon the verge of the Revolution. He said that the west hated the coast more than it feared or disliked Great Britain. To overcome this opposition the Colonial Whigs offered promises of social and political reform, fortified by extensive propaganda. The Revolution was again touched upon by Professor Abernethy who compared the social condi-

[11] The Southern Back Country on the Eve of the Revolution, by Philip Davidson; Three American Crusades: Abolition, Reconstruction, Scottsboro, by Frank L. Owsley; The Gulf Trade and Texas Independence, by J. D. Hill; The Changing Status of Women in the Ante-Bellum South, by T. P. Abernethy.

tion of the Southern women of that period with that which they attained half a century later, rather to the disadvantage of the later type. This was partly due to decreasing economic importance combined with an increased social prestige.

The various fields of history received their share of attention in the special sessions. For Ancient History, Professor C. H. Oldfather discussed the Genesis of the First Triumvirate, concluding that the first steps in the formation of the agreement were taken by Pompey, who solicited Caesar's aid in securing the legislation he desired. Professor William D. Gray, with New Light upon the Reign of Hadrian as his subject, explained that in recent years there has been a strong tendency for students working quite independently to attribute to Hadrian monuments formerly assigned to earlier or later emperors. Professor Jakob A. O. Larsen's theme was the Position of Provincial Assemblies in the Government and Society of the Late Roman Empire. He said that these bodies were more like medieval assemblies because men owed their membership primarily to their high position, being former officials of one kind or another, and all landowners. In the final paper, on the Code of Justinian, Professor A. A. Vasiliev suggested that the time was ripe for the study of the Digest and of Justinian's work in general. He held that this work was not a disastrous epilogue to the history of ancient Roman jurisprudence nor a mere prologue to the history of Byzantine post-Justinian law. In the proposed study it would be necessary to consider the process of the Orientalization of the Empire, especially from the epoch of the classical Roman jurists.

The medieval session tried the interesting experiment of holding a round-table discussion of the single question, The Renaissance: Is it Medieval or Modern? The chairman, Professor G. C. Sellery, and Professors Henry S. Lucas, Albert Hyma, and Samuel K. Wilson, found that they shared in some degree the opinion that the Renaissance was more medieval than modern, for certain of its forms were an efflorescence of medieval culture. The point was emphasized that an exaggerated importance in the development of modern culture had been given to the so-called revival of learning, first by the Humanists themselves, and then by their modern champions, Vogt, Burchhardt, and Symonds. Significant figures, like Villon, Chaucer, Commines, and the Flemish and Burgundian painters and sculptors had no connection with the classical revival. It was also urged that the bourgeois spirit, rather than the revived study of the classics, was the forerunner of that sense of practical reality which is at the basis of modern culture. The exaggerated in-

dividualism of modern times is due, however, to the pagan ideal which the Humanists adopted.

The session on Economic History was also devoted to the discussion of an important concept, the Industrial Revolution and the relation of industrial capitalism to cultural and social history. Professor Herbert Heaton said it was time to abandon the older concept, adding that too many generalizations had been based on the cotton industry alone. In the woolen industry some of the technical changes had come late in the nineteenth century. Professor Heaton also remarked that the so-called evils of industrialism were of long standing, and that the "unrighteousness" of factory owners was diminished in the light of the fact that the same men were the leaders in philanthropy and humanitarianism. The error in dating the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution from the transformation of textile manufacture was emphasized by Professor John U. Nef on the ground that it had appeared one or two centuries earlier in the organization of salt and glass works and of coal mines. Professor Nef was mainly concerned with contrasts between the progress of industrial capitalism in Great Britain and in France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Professor Edward C. Kirkland closed the discussion by calling for a synthetic interpretation of the historical process, to which industrialism contributed one key. We should avoid, he said, writing separate histories of art, literature, education, religion, and science.

Other special sessions were devoted to English History, the Near East, and to Church History. The last was held jointly with the American Society of Church History. The opening paper, by Professor Evarts B. Greene,[12] dealt with the clergy as a social group in the relatively stabilized population of the Atlantic seaboard. Among the topics which he considered were the background of the clerical career, pastoral tenure as affecting prestige, and some of the contributions the clergy made to the culture of their time. The speaker reached the conclusion that the tendency of much present-day writing is to exaggerate the decline of clerical influence in eighteenth century America. Another paper, by Professor Lillian E. Fisher, described the career of Abad y Queipo, Bishop of Michoacán. Professor Percy V. Norwood presented An Assessment of the Oxford Movement.

In the first paper in the English History section Professor W. F. Adams considered Some Aspects of English and Irish Estate Manage-

[12] The title of Professor Greene's paper was The Clerical Profession in the American Revolutionary Era.

ment, 1815–1856, basing his conclusions upon a study of the Grenville Papers at the Huntington Library. Ireland's loss and the destruction of the squirarchy, he said, were simply part of the ruin of the landlord class as a whole because of its failure to adjust itself to the new world of industrial and financial expansion. Incidentally, he pointed out that the Irish tenants of the first two dukes of Buckingham, who were satisfied with playing the great lord magnificently, as well they might with a rent roll of £75,000, suffered less than their English tenants, who paid four times as much on lands of the same quality, and who were more often evicted for nonpayment of rent. In the second paper of the session Mrs. Anna Lane Lingelbach interpreted the career of William Huskisson as President of the Board of Trade. His principal task was to bring order out of the chaos of laws that were stifling trade, commerce, and even industry. The final paper, by Professor Paul Knaplund, found that the controlling elements of Gladstone's policy were championship of suppressed nationalities and the support of the concert of Europe, while avoiding entangling alliances and conserving the strength of the empire.

The session on the Near East concentrated its attention upon the incidents and maneuvers which preceded the crisis of 1840.[13] The name of Mehemet Ali commonly suggests the conquest of Syria, but Professor Hoskins gave an almost equal place to the pasha's designs upon Arabia. Mehemet's position was delicate, for he saw the necessity of maintaining friendly relations with the English, jealous of even a remote threat to India or to their trade in the Indian seas. His great enterprise collapsed on the verge of complete success because of Lord Palmerston's countermoves at Aden and in the Persian Gulf, and because Mehemet's Syrian triumph brought about the intervention of the Four Powers to save the Turkish Empire. Some of the antecedents of this Four Power agreement were explained by Professor Mosely on the basis of material which he has recently uncovered in the Russian archives. Mr. John S. Kenyon contributed a paper dealing with the Turkish policy toward Egypt during the same period. There was also a luncheon conference for the Near East, and it turned out to be an old-fashioned experience meeting. Two of those who spoke were born there, thirty had spent some time there, and twenty-five had written, or were now engaged in writing, theses or books about the problems of the region.

[13] The Domestic Policy of Mahmoud II., with special reference to the Egyptian Question, 1833–1840, by J. S. Kenyon; Russian Rivalry with Great Britain in Turkey, 1838–1839, by Philip E. Mosely; European Aspects of the Struggle for Power in Arabia and Mesopotamia, 1837–1840, by Halford L. Hoskins.

The session dealing with Legal Records and American History was of special interest because of the recent publication of the first volume of the Association's series entitled American Legal Records. Professor Richard B. Morris, secretary of the Legal Records Committee, commented on the sources of early American law. Preliminary investigations of our early legal institutions, he said, have at least established the fact that American law did not spring full grown and fully armed from the brow of Britannia in 1776, the old formula of judicial interpretation. He declared that "social historians have singularly failed to exploit the easily available and conveniently indexed printed sources of local and superior courts. . . . The problems of the common man, the strivings of social groups, and the exploitation of labor, for example—problems largely dealt with in the court records—seem clearly more significant in the history of society than old furniture, witchcraft and dead doctors". In the publication of documents he emphasized the importance of critical selection. In the other paper Dr. A. R. Newsome presented a valuable systematic review of state and local archives of the post-Colonial period.

Another session which marks an important stage in the work of the Association was concerned with the work of the Commission on Social Studies. In it Professor A. C. Krey described the progress of the project and pointed out some Implications of the Report for Teachers. Professor R. M. Tryon and Dr. H. K. Beale dealt with aspects of the problem which they are to discuss in their particular volumes in the series now appearing under the auspices of the Commission. Their subjects were the Place of History in a Program of Integration and Freedom in Teaching the Social Sciences.

There was also a session on Historiography,[14] in which the fundamental conceptions of early seventeenth century royalists, of Edward Gibbon, and of Hippolyte Taine were interpreted. Professor Marcham said that in the controversy of King and Parliament both sides appealed to history, until the parliamentarians, possessed of the substance of power, lost their interest in the historical argument. According to Professor Swain, Gibbon believed that the Roman Empire fell because it could not "survive the loss of freedom, of virtue, and of honor", elastic terms by which Gibbon and his readers understood the habits and types of thought which underlay British society in his day. His six quartos were an

[14] The Royalist Conception of History during the Controversies which preceded the Civil Wars in England, by F. G. Marcham; Edward Gibbon and the Decline of Rome, by J. W. Swain; Taine and the Scientific Determinism of the Nineteenth Century, by Leo Gershoy.

enormous sermon on these favorite topics. In the concluding paper, Professor Gershoy discussed the atmosphere and opinions which prevailed during Taine's formative years and the great influence which Comte, Stuart Mill, and Hegel had upon the growth of his ideas.

With a national archive building now rearing its walls in Washington, it was appropriate that a session should be devoted to the organization of archives. The experience of France, Spain, and Great Britain was reviewed by Dr. T. P. Martin, of the Library of Congress, and the progress made in two American states, Illinois and Iowa, was described by Professor T. C. Pease, editor of the Illinois State Historical Collections, and Mr. C. C. Stiles, superintendent of the Public Archives, Des Moines.

At the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies Lieutenant Colonel Scammell told of the project undertaken by the National Guard Bureau of the War Department to have lists of source materials relating to the history of the national guard and other militia organizations compiled in every state and territory. This was followed by an account of the historical societies of Canada by Frederick Landon. Dr. A. H. Shearer discussed Historical Societies: Individualized or Paternalized, and Dr. Christopher B. Coleman in presenting his report as secretary of the conference included a Suggested Code for State and Local Historical Societies. The chairman of the conference, Dr. Herbert A. Kellar, proposed that the conference, which is annual, be reconstituted as a working unit and that membership be limited to organizations which could comply with such standards in regard to resources and actual accomplishment as should be determined. The plan was referred to a committee for report at the session to be held at Washington in connection with the next annual meeting. The possibilities of such a plan and such a code, Dr. Coleman has remarked, "offer an interesting field for speculation. A crucial question seems to be whether the secretariat of the Association will develop into an advisory and supervisory aid to state and local organizations or whether these bodies shall form an effective organization of their own for mutual aid and for the maintenance of better standards. Perhaps both developments are possible. The present policy of the *Review* in printing news of historical societies has been a grateful recognition of progress among these organizations."

Luncheons and dinners were also occasions for discussing important themes or listening to papers. At the luncheon conference of the historical societies, Dr. M. M. Quaife, apropos of the Kensington Stone, discoursed on The Discovery of Minnesota in 1362: a Historical Myth

in the Making. The Agricultural History Society, at its luncheon, listened to an address by Professor H. C. Nixon on The South of Our Times. Two papers were presented at the dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association: that of Dr. Adams already mentioned, and The Norwegian Element in the History of the Northwest, by Professor Laurence M. Larson, in which the speaker took the phenomena of Norwegian immigration as illustrative of the value of an intensive study of each racial group in the United States. It may be remarked that Immigrant Groups in American History was also the subject of a special session, the discussion being led by Caroline F. Ware.

The business meeting of the Association came on the last afternoon of the sessions. The Secretary, Professor Dexter Perkins, described the work of the Executive Secretariat during its first year. Among the tasks completed has been the report regarding the accessibility of unpublished doctoral theses, printed in the *Review* for July, 1933. A list of members was circulated as a supplement to the October number of the *Review*, and a list of research projects in progress by mature scholars is being sent out with the present number. A new Radio Committee has been appointed under the chairmanship of the Executive Secretary to cooperate with the National Advisory Council in Education, with a view to broaden historical programs, and a grant has been secured for experiment along this line. The Association, Professor Perkins also said, through the Executive Secretary, has also given encouragement to the project of a union catalogue in Philadelphia, with a local committee under the chairmanship of Professor Charles W. David. In speaking of the work of Dr. Read as a whole Professor Perkins said how deeply the Executive Committee and the Council appreciated "the energy, industry, imagination, and practical capacity which Dr. Read has brought to his task" and added the happy announcement that the Carnegie Corporation had made a new grant, rendering possible the continuation of the Executive Secretariat.

Professor Perkins also spoke of the work of the Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools which has now terminated its labors. This body, he said, has been working during the past five years and expects to publish the results of its deliberations and studies in about twenty volumes. "In dealing with the work of the Commission", he added, "a special word must be said with regard to the self-sacrificing labors of its Chairman, Professor A. C. Krey, who undertook this difficult, delicate, and responsible task five years ago and has discharged its responsibilities

with a tact, industry, and single-minded devotion which have been the admiration of his colleagues and of the Council."

The Secretary mentioned the serious decline in the membership during the past year, the net loss being 293. He emphasized the fact that the individual member may serve the Association in no more effective way than by obtaining new members.

Dr. Perkins reviewed the publication activities of the Association, incidentally remarking that the Revolving Fund had "revolved" to the extent of about $10,000, so that about $35,000 has been available. He explained that enough remains to pay for three more volumes. The news in regard to the publication of annual reports is not so cheering, for the Federal budget for 1932–1933 for the first time in many years contained no appropriation for this purpose. Dr. Perkins said that the Association would make an effort to have at least a small sum reinstated in the 1934 budget.

The following prizes were announced: the George Louis Beer Prize, to Robert T. Pollard, of the University of Washington, for his volume entitled *China's Foreign Relations, 1917–1931;* the John H. Dunning Prize, to Amos A. Ettinger, Allentown, for his volume entitled *The Mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé;* the Jusserand Medal, to Professor Gilbert Chinard, especially for the volumes entitled *Volney et l'Amérique, Houdon in America, L'Amérique et la rêve exotique,* and *Thomas Jefferson, Apostle of Americanism.*

The officers chosen for 1934 are: William E. Dodd, president; M. I. Rostovtzeff, first vice president; Charles H. McIlwain, second vice president; Dexter Perkins, secretary; and C. E. McGuire, treasurer. The two new members of the Council are Wallace Notestein and James F. Willard. Guy Emerson and Tracy McGregor were elected members of the Board of Trustees. Dumas Malone was chosen to fill the vacancy on the Board of Editors caused by the expiration of A. C. Cole's term.[15]

The next meeting of the Association will be held in Washington.

H. E. B.

[15] For a list of officers and committees, a summary of the Treasurer's report, and selections from the minutes of the Council, see Historical News.

WHIG PROPAGANDISTS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

"I take it that clamour is at present our best policy", wrote William Livingston in 1768; and just a few months later Samuel Adams said to James Otis, who objected to publishing the letter of the Massachusetts Assembly to Lord Hillsborough before he could possibly receive it, "What signifies that? You know it was designed for the people, and not for the minister."[1] Here we have clearly expressed the purpose of that bewildering mass of articles, essays, pamphlets, speeches, and sermons of the Revolutionary period; their varied appeal was to make coherent and articulate the growing opposition to Great Britain. We understand to-day that sufficient unity of opinion to result in concerted action is achieved only after an intensive propaganda campaign. Inflamed patriotism alone could conceive of the American Revolution as the spontaneous uprising of an outraged and indignant people; clearly the propagandists had been at work long before the nineteenth of April in '75.

If we define propaganda in the broad sense as a systematic effort through mass suggestion to gain public support for a particular idea or course of action,[2] our Revolutionary propagandist is then a man who

[1] Theodore Sedgwick, jr., *Memoir of the Life of William Livingston* (New York, 1833), p. 136; William V. Wells, *Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams* (Boston, 1866), I. 196.

[2] Definitions abound. An excellent list may be found in Frederick E. Lumley, *The Propaganda Menace*, ch. II. There is a general feeling that propaganda is not really propaganda unless it is evil and insidious. As Edward L. Bernays puts it (*Crystallizing Public Opinion*, p. 212), "The advocacy of what we believe in is education. The advocacy of what we don't believe in is propaganda." Professor Lumley's own definition is a precise description of evil propaganda. Such definitions, though justified by current usage, are entirely too narrow for the student, who is not concerned with whether propaganda is good or bad, but simply with propaganda. Professor Friedrich Schönemann, in his *Die Kunst der Massenbeeinflussung in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Berlin, 1924), calls it, as his title indicates, "the art of mass suggestion". Reynell J. R. G. Wreford neatly describes it as "the dissemination of interested information and opinion", Propaganda, Evil and Good, *Nineteenth Century and After*, XCIII. 514. Professor Harold D. Lasswell in a more academic definition sees it as "the management of collective attitudes by the manipulation of significant symbols", The Theory of Political Propaganda, *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, XXI. 627. Whatever definition is accepted there must be understood the twofold task of the propagandist: to present his own suggestions as favorably as may be, and to neutralize if he cannot actually censor inconvenient suggestions. The public must hear only one side of the case, for there is no room in the art of the propagandist for tolerance. Mr. Walter Lippmann even questions whether there can be true propaganda without some form of censorship, *Public Opinion*, p. 43.

systematically prepared the people for opposition to Great Britain and her colonial program. A quick survey of some leading Revolutionary figures, without any attempt to be inclusive, will show what a surprising number fitted this description, and how generally they appreciated the prior necessity of opinion to action.

Two—Samuel Adams and Thomas Paine—may almost be called professionals, save that their interest alone employed them. Emerson's explanation of great men illuminates our knowledge of these two: "Every master has found his materials collected, and his power lay in his sympathy with his people and in his love of the materials he wrought in." At hand for their use were the accumulated discontent of a hundred and fifty years' restive development under English control, the turbulent forces creating the inchoate Americanism they perceived, and the eighteenth century compact philosophy that was to make them free. To unite all America in one pulsating hope, to vitalize that hope with the new philosophy, this was their task. They could succeed, for they had a secret knowledge of what the people thought, wished, feared, and hated, and the power to interpret for the public "its own conscience and its own consciousness"—therein lay their strength.[3]

Many others, though not exclusively propagandists, engaged in such activities. There were John Adams, worried about his vacant law office, helping the Sons of Liberty with their transparencies, and writing steadily though heavily for the press;[4] and James Otis, whose wild inflammatory harangues in Boston town meetings did more for the cause than his bitter pamphlets.[5] Then there was Joseph Warren, whose work on the Boston committee of correspondence was made easier by his preparatory essays and speeches, none more notable than the famous Fifth of March Oration, commemorating the Boston Massacre, which contains such incredible passages as this:[6]

> Approach we then the melancholy walk of death. Hither let me call the gay companion, here let him drop a farewell tear upon that body which so late he saw vigorous and warm with social mirth—hither let me lead the

[3] Moses Coit Tyler, *Literary History of the American Revolution*, II. 42.

[4] "I have not drawn a writ since the first of November", Diary, Dec. 18, 1765, *The Works of John Adams*, Charles Francis Adams, ed., II. 155, 178 ff., 183–184.

[5] "This gentleman . . . has, I believe, contributed more than any *one* man to bring us into the state of *out-lawry* and confusion we are now in", Boston *Gazette*, Dec. 28, 1767, quoting a statement made in 1765. At one meeting he "inveighed against the Lieut. Governor in terms most suitable to have raised another Mob against him", British Museum Transcripts in the Library of Congress, C. O. 5, vol. 43, f. 121, p. 136.

[6] H. Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution* (Baltimore, 1822), p. 20; reprinted in the *Pennsylvania Journal, Supplement*, Mar. 29, 1775.

tender mother to weep over her beloved son—come widowed mourner, here satiate thy grief; behold thy murdered husband gasping on the ground, and to complete the pompous show of wretchedness, bring in each hand thy infant children to bewail their father's fate—take heed, ye infant babes, lest, whilst your streaming eyes are fixed upon the ghastly corpse, *your feet slide on the stones bespattered with your father's brains.*

Even young Alexander Hamilton, whose pamphlet attacks and scattered handbills, as he said, gave the "necessary alarm" against the Tories, inspired the Whigs during the war by accounts of battles done up with the usual newspaper embellishments.[7] John Dickinson began early with a pamphlet on the Stamp Act, wrote the *Farmer's Letters,* composed the American Liberty Song, and answered Sam Adams's request in 1773 for further efforts with a broadside opposing the Tea Act, not because of the legal principles involved but because the British East India Company now "cast their Eyes on *America,* as a new Theatre, whereon to exercise their Talents of Rapine, Oppression and Cruelty".[8]

Thomas Jefferson, now learning the arts of party leadership which were to secure him the presidency, knew how to inspirit the people with wonderful words of delusive hope. The Declaration of Independence, surpassed by few if any propaganda efforts, placed within seeming grasp the unattainable aspirations of men. It recorded no accomplished fact; it evidenced no new social order. Only as men fought for it did they give meaning to it. Each effort should *now* be made to keep up the spirits of the people, said Jefferson on July 1, 1776;[9] he knew the Declaration was inadequate in itself.

The more obscure Colonel Landon Carter, who essays in the press were brought home to the people on county court days, tried knowingly but vaguely, as all good propagandists should do, to convince them "that the case of the Bostonians was the case of all America & if they submitted to this arbitrary taxation begun by the Parliament, all America must, and then farewell to all our Liberties".[10] James Iredell, future dignitary of the Supreme Bench, passed from hand to hand a manuscript

[7] *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay,* Henry P. Johnston, ed., I. 41; *The Works of Alexander Hamilton,* John C. Hamilton, ed., I. 85.

[8] "Rusticus", conveniently found in *The Writings of John Dickinson,* Paul Leicester Ford, ed., I. 460. He first refused, saying that he took up his pen only from a sense of duty, but later changed his mind. Charles J. Stillé, *Life and Times of John Dickinson,* pp. 103 ff.

[9] *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* Paul Leicester Ford, ed., II. 41.

[10] Diary of Col. Landon Carter, *William and Mary College Quarterly,* XIV. 246. See also *The Letters of Richard Henry Lee,* James Curtis Ballagh, ed., I. 8 f., 12, and Lee Transcripts (Virginia Historical Society), pp. 66 f.

he had written on the advantages of independence and in the charges to his grand juries declared that British depravity and cruelty were almost solely responsible for the war. And William Henry Drayton, effective essayist until his death in 1779, though first set against the rising Americanism, finally reached the astounding position that [11]

> The Almighty created America to be independent of Britain: let us beware of the impiety of being backward to act as instruments in the Almighty Hand, now extended to accomplish his purpose. . . .

Other political figures depended largely upon oratory to win a following. Mob leaders—Isaac Sears, Ebenezer Mackintosh—raised the pitch of emotional tensity in words now lost save as we know what crowd leaders have always said to their followers. Although their mad and devilish speeches made sober citizens tremble behind barred doors and windows, they guided the stirrings of social discontent into the comparatively peaceful paths of imperial revolution. In the epitaph of a New York leveler, shot on the thirteenth of March, 1775, we hear faint echoes of mob appeals which aided in subtly changing social revolution into political revolution: [12]

> HERE WILLIAM FRENCH his Body lies,
> For Murder his Blood for Vengeance cries.
> King Georg the third his Tory crew
> tha with a bawl his head Shot threw.
> For Liberty and his Country's Good,
> he Lost his Life his Dearest Blood.

Still others, themselves doing no speaking or writing, knew the necessity for first converting the people, and hoped with William Hooper that "nothing will be omitted that may work upon their Reason, or affect their passions".[13] Washington himself realized that no plans could be successful unless the leaders would "be at some pains to explain matters to the people, and stimulate them to cordial agreements". As commander in chief of his little army he saw the dampening effect of flagging spirits and constantly urged his more literary friends to act upon the "hopes and fears of the people at large . . . in such a manner, as to make them approve and second your views".[14]

[11] John Drayton, *Memoirs of the American Revolution* (Charleston, 1821), II. 274.

[12] Frank Moore, *Diary of the American Revolution* (New York, 1860), I. 51. This is simply to say that the Revolution was not primarily or exclusively a class movement.

[13] William Hooper to Joseph Hewes and John Penn, 1776, Hayes Collection, North Carolina Historical Commission.

[14] Kate Mason Rowland, *Life of George Mason*, I. 139; *The Writings of George Washington*, Jared Sparks, ed., VII. 62.

Preachers and writers, too, were propagandists. Most of them no doubt caught their tone from the spirit of the times, as must all whose livelihood depends upon intimate emotional contacts with their followers. Some, however, worked clearly and definitely to formulate public opinion. Dr. Samuel Cooper, to select only one, wrote constantly for the press, took political affairs into his pulpit, wrote Hancock's Oration on the Fifth of March, and kept in close touch with the Sons of Liberty. Francis Hopkinson, writer, called his own political squibs "ammunition", and spread through the papers his attacks on the British administration.[15]

One man, William Livingston, so perfectly exemplifies the typical propagandist of the Revolution that a more detailed treatment of him may well stand for them all. Above rather than of the people, he knew them shrewdly, and was one of the few who during the war not only realized the urgency of reanimating their enthusiasm, but set about it. The family, politically influential in New York, dour Presbyterians, found their most determined opposition in the wealthier, Anglican De Lanceys. Young Will, studying away in the 1740's at the parentally imposed law books (for he had wanted to paint), saw Anglicans taking over the newly founded King's College, Anglicans arrogantly demanding an American bishop, and Anglican De Lanceys about to wreck the political power of the family. His Presbyterian dislike of establishments fully confirmed by this doleful outlook, Livingston began a long fight on the Anglicans, writing persistently against the plans for an American episcopate until his essays had, as he said, "an universal alarm. . . . For I take it that clamour is at present our best policy, and that if the country can be animated against it, our superiors at home will not be easily induced to grant so arrogant a claim, at the expense of the public tranquility."[16] With such ideas and with his background, William Livingston could not conceivably have been a Tory, but he was in some apparent doubt himself, and it was not until independence was safely declared and he was irrevocably bound to the cause as governor of New Jersey that he again called upon his abilities as a propagandist, aware that the campaign of mind was as hard as the campaign of arms. He

[15] Alice M. Baldwin, *New England Clergy and the American Revolution*, pp. 93, 156; *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, Albert Henry Smyth, ed., VII. 351, n. To his wife Hopkinson wrote an account of the destruction of his home by the British and said: "I will send some of the enclosed Papers to camp and take care it shall be in every News Paper." Charles Hildeburn, Loyalist Ladies of the Revolution, p. 64, MS. in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

[16] Sedgwick, pp. 136 f.

established the first New Jersey newspaper during the Revolution and used its columns extensively. His essays, broadsides, and speeches all show a real knowledge of crowd psychology. The most important motive in war psychosis is not reason or justice, or even self-interest, but hate, and he knew it. Compare this paragraph from one of his addresses to the New Jersey legislature with the anti-German propaganda of the last war:[17]

> They have warred upon decripid age; warred upon defenceless youth. They have committed hostilities against the possessors of literature; and the ministers of religion: Against public records; and private monuments; and books of improvement; and papers of curiosity; and against the Arts and Sciences. They have butchered the wounded, asking for quarter; mangled the dying, weltering in their blood; refused to the dead the rights of sepulture; suffered prisoners to perish for want of sustenance; violated the chastity of women; disfigured private dwellings of taste and elegance; and in the rage of impiety and barbarism, profaned edifices dedicated to Almighty God . . . . who will not always suffer *the sceptre of the wicked to rest on the lot of the righteous. . . .*

That might have been written in 1918.

This rapid sketch of Revolutionary propagandists has shown how generally it was understood that prepared opinion was requisite to concerted action; it has shown presidents, governors, judges, preachers, writers, and mob leaders uniting to excite the people against England. Without this background of propaganda there would have been no war in 1775 and no Declaration of Independence in 1776.

A concrete example of how the propagandists handled a specific problem—the defeatist movement of 1778—will give substantive proof of what has been said.

The year 1778 marks that period in the American Revolution which comes in every war, when the opposing forces, tired out, draw apart to gauge each other's determination, sparring cautiously as they gather strength. In America the army was weary, starved, and almost naked; desertions increased dangerously and sixteen thousand militiamen went home. Money depreciated and prices soared; supplies could hardly be bought. The Tories, taking hope from the distressing state of affairs, became unusually active. In Boston doubtful Whig and reviving Tory were almost indistinguishable and town meetings "got to be just as the affair of the witches at Salem,—everyone naming his neighbor". Tory propagandists filled the few papers open to them with ridicule of the

[17] *Archives of the State of New Jersey*, ser. 2, vol. I. pp. 301–305.

American leaders, criticism of Washington, and well-founded satires upon the fruits of independence. Even the new French treaty, the aggrieved patriots found, did not bring the immediate relief they had anticipated, for it cut off supplies from France, who needed them herself, it brought no French army or navy to America, and Tories charged that it simply meant the establishment of popery, the rebuilding of the French empire in the Western Hemisphere, and the destruction of American commerce, absorbed by France. Everywhere men were puzzled and uncertain. America was tired and discouraged.

At this moment Lord North introduced two bills providing for reconciliation with the colonies. They meant in effect a return to the status of 1763, with certain modifications in favor of the colonies. Commissioners—Lord Carlisle, Sir George Johnstone, and William Eden—were chosen to present the terms to anyone authorized to treat. The bills together with Lord North's speech to Parliament were distributed from Sir William Howe's headquarters at Philadelphia on April 18.

Here was a real test of the Whig propagandists, and they prepared to meet it. Washington obtained copies immediately and forwarded them to Congress with the hurried advice that they be published, "and persons of leisure and ability set to work to counteract the impressions they may make on the minds of the people".[18] Before night on the twentieth, congressional leaders were spreading the alarm. Copies were sent to state governors and other people of authority. Henry Laurens, President of Congress, forwarded a copy to Governor Trumbull of Connecticut urging that "its wicked designs ought to be repelled [writing "compelled" in his haste] everywhere, with the utmost energy"; and to James Duane he wrote, "your Morris and our Drayton have it in hand I make no doubt but that we shall return it decently tarred and feathered".[19] The Maryland delegates, John Henry, jr., Samuel Chase, and Charles Carroll, warned Governor Johnson to publish the proposal only when proper strictures had been made upon it, the first writing, "it will prove more dangerous to our cause than ten thousand of their best Troops", the second, "The Hour to try the Firmness and prudence of Man is near at Hand", and the third, "try, for God sake and the sake of human Nature, to rouse our countrymen from their lethargy".[20] On April 22 Congress itself published an address warning the people

[18] *Writings of Washington*, V. 328.

[19] Laurens Letter Book, Mar. 6–Sept. 23, 1778, pp. 53 f., South Carolina Historical Society; *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, Edmund C. Burnett, ed., III. 171.

[20] Burnett, III. 178, n., 180, 181.

against what it still thought were spurious terms of peace; and while riders were posting from York to carry the news, Washington was calling upon William Livingston for his support:[21]

> You will see that their aim is, under offers of peace, to divide and disunite us; and, unless their views are early investigated and exposed in a striking manner and in various shapes by able pens, I fear they will be but too successful, and that they will give a very unhappy if not a ruinous cast to our affairs. . . . If your leisure will possibly permit, I should be happy that the whole should be discussed by your pen.

Livingston replied immediately:[22]

> I have sent Collins a number of letters, as if by different hands, not even excluding the tribe of petticoats,[23] all calculated to caution America against the insidious arts of enemies. This mode of rendering a measure unpopular, I have frequently experienced in my political days to be of surprising efficacy, as the common people collect from it that everybody is against it, and for that reason those who are really for it grow discouraged, from magnifying in their own imagination the strength of their adversaries beyond its true amount.

Samuel Adams, with his rare ability to find out things before anyone else, had already written Richard Henry Lee from Boston the day the bills were distributed from Philadelphia:[24]

> As there [are] every where awful Tories enough, to distract the Minds of the People, would it not be wise for Congress by a Publication of their own to set this important Intelligence in a clear Light before them, and fix in their Minds the first Impressions in favor of Truth?

[21] *Writings of Washington,* V. 331–332.

[22] Sedgwick, p. 282. Coilins was the editor of the *New Jersey Gazette.* The same day Livingston wrote Laurens: "I hope we shall not be such Blockheads as to accede to ridiculous Terms when we have so fair a Prospect of obtaining Peace, upon almost any Terms—Tho' my good friends in New-York have faithfully promised to cut my throat for writing, which they seem to resent more than fighting, I have already begun to sound the Alarm in our Gazette in a variety of Letters, as tho' every body execrated the proposals of Britain." Henry Laurens Papers, South Carolina Historical Society.

[23] On May 6 there appeared in the *New Jersey Gazette* a contribution signed BELINDA, calling upon all women to enter a solemn protest against the proposals, and reported that "the fair ones in our neighbourhood have already entered into a resolve for every mother to disown her son, and refuse the caresses of her husband, and for every maiden to reject the addresses of her gallant, where such husband, son or gallant, shows the least symptoms of being imposed upon by this flimsy subterfuge, which I call the dying speech, and last groans of Great-Britain". Belinda was, of course, Governor Livingston, but the editor of the *New Jersey Archives* in a note declares that this was "probably the first political communication ever written by a New Jersey woman and addressed to the editor of a newspaper". Ser. 2, vol. II., pp. 195 f.

[24] *The Writings of Samuel Adams,* Harry Alonzo Cushing, ed., IV. 22 f.

His letter, of course, arrived too late to influence the decision of Congress.

Confirmation of the French alliance and the retreat of the British from Philadelphia buoyed the hopes of Congress, and when the commissioners arrived in June they were met with a flat refusal to treat on any other terms than the removal of all British forces and the recognition of American independence. This did not end the matter, however, for the commissioners continued to demand a hearing and appealed to the people through proclamations and private letters, while Tories aided them with pleas for a return to the "most wise and gracious of governments", saying that Americans had been duped into continuing the unnatural war simply "To pursue a PHANTOM OF INDEPENDENCY; or, in other Words, to support at the Expence of her own Blood and Treasure; *the* POWER *and consequence of a Set of Men, who oppose Peace merely because such an Event would sink them into Obscurity*".[25]

To hold the allegiance of the people, to defeat the peace movement, the propagandists exercised their every ability. William Livingston began the essays of "Hortentius" early in May and continued them until the commissioners were safely aboard ship for England, supplementing them by such conceits as his rather heavy satire would permit; William Henry Drayton performed one of his last services to America in the series of articles initialed W. H. D.; Gouverneur Morris wrote under the pen name "An American"; and Tom Paine devoted two numbers of the *Crisis* to the peace proposals. Important newspapers reprinted these essays and they were read everywhere.[26]

The general course of the argument against reconciliation was that England made the proposals only because she was convinced of the impossibility of winning the war, that it would ruin America to come to terms at this time, that the French alliance assured American independence, and that instead of listening to compromises, the people should redouble their efforts. The commissioners' proclamations were parodied, their characters impugned, their authority questioned, and their good

[25] *Royal Gazette*, June 3, 1778. Tory propaganda was unusually adroit during this controversy.

[26] *E.g.*, New York *Journal*, July–Aug., 1778; *Pennsylvania Packet*, July, 1778, Feb., 1779; *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, July, 1778; *New Jersey Gazette*, July, 1778, Mar., 1779; *North Carolina Gazette*, July, 1778; *Connecticut Journal*, July-Aug., 1778; *Massachusetts Spy*, Oct., 1778; *South Carolina and American General Gazette*, Apr., 1779. Similar in character was "Bob Centinel", which appeared in the *Massachusetts Spy*, July 23, 1778; New York *Journal*, Sept. 14, 1778; *Pennsylvania Packet*, Sept. 26, 1778; and the Boston *Independent Ledger*, clipped in the *Connecticut Courant*, Nov. 3, 1778.

faith denied.[27] Every statement they made was contradicted. Their charge that France would prolong the war in her own interests brought an immediate repudiation from the treaty itself and a challenge from the intense Marquis de Lafayette. When they threatened America with the extremes of war, from which so far the "benevolence" of England had saved her, propagandists asked with apparent horror, are you men or devils? "You have already equalled, and in many cases excelled, the savages of either Indies; and if you have yet a cruelty in store, you must have imported it, unmixed with every human material, from the original warehouse of hell."[28] On every hand the people were warned not to be led astray by false offers:[29]

> Be not deceived by any specious pretences of friendship that may be offered you by Britain; justly may you suspect the root from whence they spring, hypocrisy and inability conjoined. Were they able to subdue you, they would delight to trample you to mortar, and the crackling of your bones under their horses hoofs, would be to them an agreeable sound. . . .

The peace proposals received the same treatment. Parliament, it was said, offered to absorb sufficient Continental currency to pay off colonial debts; the propagandists said England could not discharge her own. Parliament offered representation; propagandists said America wanted no representation in a British Parliament. Parliament offered to give up taxation of the colonies except that necessary to regulate trade, and to use any money so collected in the colony which paid it; propagandists denied the right of any nation or group to control American commerce. As William Livingston put it:[30]

> And what can be more provoking than for Great-Britain, after acknowledging the superiority of our arms, to propound such a controul over our commerce as we remonstrated against before the commencement of the war; and which would infallibly render us and our remotest posterity the slaves and tributaries of a nation venal, corrupt, abandoned, and rushing

[27] Sir George Johnstone issued a statement interpreted by the Whigs as an attempt to bribe congressional leaders. Laurens sent this and other papers of the commissioners to William Livingston, saying, "Mr. Johnstone's Declaration in particular cannot escape in New Jersey the correction it deserves, when the proper time shall come, of which due notice shall be given, it ought to be bated everywhere." September, 1778, Laurens Letter Book, Mar. 6–Sept. 23, 1778.

[28] *The Crisis*, No. VI., *The Complete Works of Thomas Paine* (New York, 1922), II. 171.

[29] Fitzhugh McKay, *American Liberty Asserted* (Lancaster, 1778), p. 14. A printed sermon in the Library of Congress.

[30] *New Jersey Gazette*, May 6, 1778.

headlong into inextricable perdition? But to palliate this ruinous measure, it is sugar'd over with "that the net-proceeds of such duties shall be always paid and applied to and for the use of the colony, &c. in which the same shall be respectively levied;" that is, in plain English, to maintain legions of hungry ministerial dependents, who are to be sent amongst us to accumulate fortunes, and then re-cross the Atlantic to dissipate in luxury what they amassed by iniquity, and thus make room for another set equally penurious and rapacious. For my own part I would rather pay the tax immediately into the English exchequer, as I think it infinitely more eligible to support a number of rogues in London than in America.

In short, said the propagandists:[31]

Away with your fleets and your armies, acknowledge the independence of America, and as Ambassadors, not Commissioners, solicit a treaty of peace, amity, commerce and alliance with the rising Stars of this western world. Your nation totters on the brink of a stupendous precipice, and even delay will ruin her.

Other forms of suggestion popularized and supported straight argument. The celebrations on the Fourth of July were more impressive than usual, for it was such demonstrations, as John Adams had said several years before, that cultivated the sensations of freedom, tinged the minds of the people, impregnated them with the sentiments of liberty, and rendered them fond of the leaders in the cause, and averse and bitter against all opposers.[32] Orations attacked the compromise measures and held out the glorious benefits of independence. David Ramsay closed a long discourse in Charleston with words full of hope, hope vague and unreal, but the more significant in its unreality:[33]

Our sun of political happiness is already risen, and hath lifted its head over the mountains, illuminating our hemisphere with liberty, light, and polished life. Our independence will redeem one quarter of the globe from tyranny and oppression, and consecrate it the chosen seat of truth, justice, freedom, learning and religion.

Facts were distorted and rumors propagated. It was said that fifteen hundred Hessians had deserted from the army in New York, and that the British were so discouraged they were planning to give up the contest in America and look to their interests in the West Indies. Arthur Lee gave color to this rumor by reporting that a broadside had been distributed in London on the authority of Lord North himself containing

[31] New York *Journal*, July 6, 1778.
[32] *Works*, II. 218.
[33] Niles, *Principles*, pp. 64–72.

the words: "All hope of conquest is . . . over. *America stands on high ground; France and England must now court her.* We have no possible chance of making peace with her, but by an immediate act of parliament, giving her perfect independence."[34] Every instance of American bravery or success was magnified, for as Tom Paine said, "It is always dangerous to spread an alarm . . . unless the prospect of success be held out with it, and that not only as probable but naturally essential".[35] American resources, American man power, American generals could never be overcome, and with God's manifest intention to preserve his chosen people in the Western World, independence was inevitable. "If God be for us", said triumphant Whigs, "who can be against us?" And Tom Paine taunted the commissioners with not possessing, after three years of war, a single foot of land on the *continent* of America: "Staten Island, York Island, a small part of Long Island, and Rhode Island, circumscribe your power".[36] By such arts the commissioners were completely routed, and on October 17 they sailed for England, beaten men.

We know now that America could not stop. The propagandists, recognizing this, knew that before the finishing blow to British power in America could be given, courage must rise with danger and hope with fear, and that they alone could so inspire the people: they had possessed for themselves the words of St. Paul, "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

PHILIP G. DAVIDSON.

Agnes Scott College.

[34] New York *Journal*, Sept. 7, 1778.
[35] Moncure D. Conway, *Life of Thomas Paine*, I. 159.
[36] *The Crisis*, No. VI.

THE RETROCESSION OF LOUISIANA IN SPANISH POLICY [1]

If Henry Adams's *History of the United States* had ended instead of beginning with 1800, he might have written a very different account of Spain's retrocession of Louisiana to France in that year. As it is, his *History* coincides almost precisely with the most humiliating period in the history of the Spanish monarchy, a period in which Napoleon first bent Charles IV. to his will and then broke him. Less familiar with the events preceding the treaty of San Ildefonso than with those which followed, Adams's view of that episode was inevitably colored by the melancholy sequel. If not every American schoolboy, at least every American historian has read his graphic story of the negotiation, and remembers how the impatient Napoleon, returning to Paris flushed with the victory of Marengo and finding the retrocession still uncompleted by the reluctant Spaniards, directed his ambassador at Madrid to make them stand and deliver; how the ambassador, Alquier, with an arrogance worthy of his master, transmitted the order to the Spanish minister of foreign affairs; and how the latter meekly made a reply which measures the degradation of Spain: "Eh! Who told you that I would not give you Louisiana?" and proceeded forthwith to the surrender.[2]

A better knowledge of Spanish policy toward Louisiana in the decade before 1800 would have led Adams to suspect the truth of this story, which he drew from a French source. This suspicion in turn would have prompted him to examine the Spanish sources with equal care. From these he would have learned that the dispatches of his informant, Ambassador Alquier, are altogether misleading, partly because the ambassador yielded to the temptation, which all diplomats feel and few can resist, to enhance the merit of success by magnifying the difficulty of his mission, and partly because he simply did not know what was going on behind the scenes.[3] He may really have believed that his bullying

[1] The present article was written during the preparation of a book, The Mississippi Question, 1795–1803, which will be published shortly. The writer was aided by a grant from the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation in 1929.

[2] Henry Adams, *History of the United States* (New York, 1889), I. 363–365.

[3] Speaking of Alquier's picturesque dispatches from Madrid, André Fugier, the best authority on the subject, says, "Mais il est véritablement difficile d'ajouter la moindre foi à ses racontars vraiment insensés, d'autant qu'Alquier dissimule à peine l'hostilité dont il était animé à l'égard de l'Espagne" (*Napoléon et l'Espagne, 1799–1808*, Paris, 1930, I. 96). This work is indispensable to the student of diplomatic relations between France and Spain in the period covered, but its author does not attempt to settle the principal question raised in the present article.

forced the spineless submission of the Spanish minister to his demand for Louisiana; but as a matter of fact the Spaniard, declaring that the province "costs us more than it is worth", had already taken the initiative in proposing the cession through a confidential agent in Paris, and Talleyrand, for reasons of his own, had concealed the offer from Alquier. Writers since Adams have added a great deal to our knowledge of the negotiation, but only a little to our understanding of Spanish policy. This can be explained both by the fact that French, not Spanish, policy was the principal object of interest with them, and also by the persistent belief that Spain was unwilling throughout the series of negotiations from 1795 to 1800 to part with Louisiana.[4] Under the circumstances, it seems worth while to tell the story again in the light of the more ample documentation which has been made available since Adams's day.[5]

The retrocession of Louisiana to France is directly traceable to Spain's treaty of 1795 with the United States. As is well known, Spain had once set great store by the province. Its acquisition from France at the end of

[4] Only Jerónimo Bécker, *Historia de las relaciones exteriores de España en el siglo XIX.* (Madrid, 1924–1926), gives the Spanish side of the Louisiana business, and his account throws no light on the antecedents of the treaty of 1800. Fugier, I. 29, states erroneously that the Directory rejected the treaty of June 27, 1796, because it did not provide for the retrocession of Louisiana. F. P. Renaut, La question de la Louisiane, 1796–1806, *Revue de l'histoire des colonies françaises,* 1918, pp. 129 ff., states the facts regarding that treaty correctly (pp. 149–151); but he was apparently unaware of the existence of Urquijo's letter to Hervas of June 22, 1800 (see below, n. 30), and gives a misleading account of the negotiation of that year (pp. 187–189). Raymond Guyot, *Le Directoire et la paix de l'Europe* (Paris, 1911), was so intent upon proving his *monnaie d'échange* thesis that he has little to say about Spanish policy; and he passes very lightly over some important phases of the negotiation in the period 1795–1799. Frederick Jackson Turner, The Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley in the Period of Washington and Adams, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, X. 269, says in regard to the negotiation of 1796, "Godoy resolutely refused to give up Louisiana". Edward Channing, *A History of the United States,* IV. 303–307, points out that Spain was willing to part with Louisiana, and yet he finds it necessary to speak of Napoleon's putting "intense pressure" on Spain in 1800; and it is difficult to see why he says that the "first effective impulse to the rebuilding of the French colonial empire in North America was given by Talleyrand and may be dated, well enough, from the year 1798".

[5] Attention should be called to the fact that an important group of documents relating to this question, which once existed in the Spanish archives but apparently has never been used by any historian, has disappeared. It was called the *expediente de la Luisiana,* and there are several references to it in the correspondence of the period preserved in the Sección de Estado of the Archivo Histórico Nacional at Madrid; but Sr. Campillo, who has long been the chief of that section and is now director of the archives as well, states that after a long and careful search he has been unable to find it. The present writer also searched for it on two occasions (1929 and 1933), but with no better success. He believes, however, that the discovery of the lost *expediente* would not require any material alteration of the present account of the retrocession.

the Seven Years' War was indeed a notable feature of Spain's defensive expansion in North America under Charles III.—an expansion which also carried the Spanish flag several hundred miles farther northward in California. Eagerly accepting France's offer to cede Louisiana,[6] the court planned to make the province an integral part of the empire, transform it into a colony of the standard Spanish type, and, by promoting its commerce and agriculture, convert it into an impenetrable barrier against the British colonies. By 1795, however, experience had shown that this ambitious plan could never succeed, and the court abandoned it, concluding the Treaty of San Lorenzo, which gave the United States a part of the territory that Spain had hoped to keep, rendered the peaceful penetration of the remainder by the Americans a certainty, and put them in a position to conquer not only Louisiana but also Florida if they were not content with peaceful penetration.

The Treaty of San Lorenzo marked the reversal of the court's policy toward Louisiana, for it was made in tacit recognition of the fact that Spain's position in the Mississippi Valley had become untenable, and it contained stipulations which were sure to hasten the inevitable withdrawal. Louisiana had been valued by Spain primarily as a barrier against the Anglo-Americans, and it no longer served that purpose. Henceforth the province was regarded by the court in the same way that, according to recent French writers, it was regarded by the Directory, namely, as a *monnaie d'échange* of the foreign office.[7] Useless as a colony, it might still have great value as a diplomatic pawn. If there was any French bullying in the Louisiana negotiation of the next five years, France wasted its energy, for bullying was not necessary and at that stage it could not be effective. All France needed to do was to offer a good price, and if that were not done Spain still had strength enough and pride enough to resist intimidation. The key to the retrocession of Louisiana is not French bullying but Spanish bargaining.

Any account of Spanish policy toward Louisiana in this period must begin and end with Manuel de Godoy, Prince of the Peace. Whether as minister of foreign affairs, a position which he held from 1793 to 1798, or as the chief favorite of the queen, who raised him to power, and of the king, who kept him there, Godoy had more influence upon Spanish policy than any other person at court, and his correspondence

[6] An excellent article by Professor Arthur S. Aiton, The Diplomacy of the Louisiana Cession, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI. 701–720, shows that, contrary to the opinion long held by historians, France surrendered Louisiana with reluctance and Spain was eager to acquire it.

[7] See the works of Guyot and Renaut cited above, note 4.

and memoirs show that he was deeply interested in Louisiana. His policy in regard to it cannot be understood apart from the context of world politics. That he took a comprehensive view of imperial problems and that he appreciated their extreme gravity and attempted to find a solution for them can hardly be doubted. In the period with which we are concerned he was not yet the pudgy, self-complacent courtier of Goya's well-known portrait, but an energetic young *arriviste* striving hard to prove himself worthy of fortune's favors. His equipment for the task of saving the Spanish empire was by no means ideal. Speaking of his linguistic accomplishments, one of the French agents at Madrid said, "He knows about as much French as an Algonquin"; and he was notoriously vain, pretentious, and grasping. The latter vice, however, might become a virtue if put to the service of his country, and with all his failings he possessed an uncommon share of intelligence and pertinacity, and courage of a sort. It was obvious that by serving Spain he would serve himself, for evidences of statesmanship would fortify him in the position which he had won through personal charm.

The result of his labors in the crisis confronting Spain in 1795 was a diplomatic revolution. His coming to power had been signalized by the conclusion of the alliance of 1793 with Great Britain and the beginning of war with the French regicides. The British alliance was not his own idea, but was inherited from Florida Blanca, first minister of state of Charles III. and Charles IV. from 1777 to 1792. Another inheritance from his distinguished predecessor was Eugenio de Llaguno, a savant of some note and secretary of the *Suprema Junta de Estado* in Florida Blanca's time, who had been assigned as political mentor to the youthful minister. By the end of 1794 Godoy had had enough of this tutelage. No longer content merely to hold the helm, he resolved to put the ship of state on a new course that he himself had plotted. The old policy had resulted in a disastrous war with France, a dangerous controversy with the United States, a highly unsatisfactory alliance with Great Britain, and widespread unrest in Spain, and a thorough renovation seemed imperative. It also seemed feasible. By making peace with France he would protect Spain from its most formidable enemy in Europe. By preserving peace with the United States he would neutralize one of the two powers that could do Spain the greatest injury in America. The other power, Great Britain, might indeed take Spain's desertion of the alliance of 1793 as a cause for war, but Godoy had come to the conclusion that even alliance with the British was no guaranty against their aggression; and he had reason to believe that if they were pre-

vented from getting the coöperation of the United States, they would be unable to carry out any extensive campaign against Spanish America.[8]

Louisiana played an important part in his plans at this juncture; in short, it was cast for a sacrificial rôle. The wolves were closing in on the imperial sleigh, one of the children must be thrown to them, and none could be spared with less regret than the adopted daughter, Louisiana. An outlying province which had cost nothing to get and a great deal to keep, it could not be assimilated to the traditional type of Spanish colony, had become a corridor for smuggling with other Spanish colonies, and involved Spain not only in costly competition with the American frontier but also in many dangerous controversies with the governments of the United States and Great Britain.[9] Fortunately for Godoy, Louisiana could be made to serve his purpose both with France, which had begun to clamor for the retrocession of the province, and with the United States, which was threatening to go to war unless Spain granted its citizens certain concessions in the Mississippi Valley. The Americans would be satisfied with the territory north of the thirty-first parallel and east of the Mississippi, and with the free navigation of that river and a place of deposit at New Orleans. These concessions would still leave intact the Louisiana ceded to Spain by France a generation earlier, which was all that France could reasonably expect to recover; and the retrocession would carry out Florida Blanca's plan of enlisting another European power in support of Spain's resistance to the American advance toward the Gulf of Mexico and the silver mines of New Spain.

The first step was to put an end to the war with France. Accordingly the envoys of the two powers met at Basel in May, 1795, and began a negotiation which was concluded in July. Spain had been beaten and must pay for peace with a territorial cession. France was determined that this should be Louisiana; Spain, that it should be Santo Domingo. Badly as it needed peace, the Spanish court put up such a firm resistance that France finally gave in, accepted the latter colony, and signed the treaty.

Godoy's stubborn refusal to gratify the French on this occasion arose not from unwillingness to part with Louisiana but from the determination to keep it until he had used it to effect the second stage of his diplomatic revolution by coming to a good understanding with the

[8] Archivo Histórico Nacional (Madrid), Sección de Estado, MS. volume entitled "Actas del Supremo Consejo de Estado", entry for Dec. 29, 1794. These archives will hereafter be referred to as A.H.N., Est. See also Arthur Preston Whitaker, *The Spanish-American Frontier, 1783–1795* (Boston, 1927), chs. XII.-XIV.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 216–220.

United States. The mere avoidance of war was not enough—that might have been accomplished by ceding Louisiana to France at Basel. What his policy required was a positively friendly arrangement. He even hoped for an alliance, and when he found that that was out of the question, he played the part of generous benefactor of the Americans, conceding virtually all they asked for in the Mississippi Valley and throwing in for good measure some very liberal clauses on the subject of neutral rights. The result was the Treaty of San Lorenzo (October 28, 1795), which he thought would keep the Americans neutral and make their neutrality benevolent in case England should declare war on Spain.

That done, he was through with Louisiana. Two months after he signed the Treaty of San Lorenzo he showed his true opinion of the colony by reopening the negotiation with France with the offer to cede Louisiana in return for Santo Domingo, which he had just given the French at Basel in order to be able to keep the continental colony.[10] The time had come for Spain to withdraw from the Mississippi Valley, and the only question was whether it could get a good price for a province it could not afford to keep. Unfortunately for Godoy, the Directory too was engaged in bargain hunting. It welcomed the revival of its cherished project, but refused to consider the proposed exchange, declaring that in the hands of France Louisiana would become an effective screen for the Spanish colonies and that Spain needed no other compensation.

In spite of this unfavorable beginning, it looked for a time as if Godoy's plan might work out to perfection. As soon as he had obtained the formal ratification of the Treaty of San Lorenzo and an emphatic expression of approval from the king in a full meeting of the council of state (May 27, 1796), and had dispatched orders to Louisiana regarding its execution (June 1), he immediately obtained the signature of the French plenipotentiary to a treaty (June 27) which provided for the retrocession of Louisiana. In return, Spain was to receive Gibraltar, which it was believed in some quarters could be taken without great difficulty, and France also agreed to make every effort to obtain fishing rights at Newfoundland for the Spaniards.[11] Though the Directory

[10] Dhermand to Delacroix, Madrid, Dec. 21, 1795, deciphered copy, Archives du ministère des Affaires étrangères (Paris), Correspondance politique, Espagne, vol. 638, ff. 267–269; Roume's reflections on the proposed exchange, Madrid, Dec. 20, 1795, *ibid.*, États-Unis, Supplément, vol. 7, ff. 28–30.

[11] Renaut, pp. 149, 150, and 211 (text of the article relating to Louisiana); Guyot, pp. 239–243.

refused ratification on the ground that its agent had exceeded his powers and had given Spain the better of the bargain, this treaty nevertheless furnishes conclusive proof that Godoy was acting in good faith when he reopened the negotiation in December, 1795, and that as soon as he had conciliated the Americans by giving them a part of Louisiana and by burdening the rest of the province with onerous commercial concessions, he was ready to sell the burdened remnant to France. Only the negative of the French government itself prevented the conclusion of a treaty of retrocession in 1796.[12]

Whatever disappointment the Spanish court may have felt at this rebuff was allayed a few weeks later by the conclusion of another treaty, which provided for an alliance between the two powers and left the Louisiana business for further negotiation. Since the treaty also contained a blanket guaranty by France of all of Spain's possessions, and since the benevolent neutrality of the United States had, Godoy thought, been bought and paid for, Spain's American dominions had apparently been given the maximum degree of security against British aggression. The court could now proceed without undue haste to haggle over the price of Louisiana.

Two unexpected developments soon wrecked the plan so carefully elaborated by the young minister. The first was the conclusion of an "explanatory article" by Great Britain and the United States which purported to clarify the meaning of certain portions of Jay's Treaty of 1794. The article gave great offense to the Spanish court, for it reaffirmed the British right to the navigation of the Mississippi River and thereby undid what Godoy considered an important part of his work at San Lorenzo, namely, the insertion in that treaty of a clause so worded as, in his opinion, to restrict the right of navigating the river to the United States and Spain. Since the Treaty of San Lorenzo was posterior to Jay's Treaty, by which Great Britain and the United States had each guaranteed to the other the free navigation of the Mississippi, Godoy thought his clever wording of the article in question would not only destroy the British claim but also sow discord between the British and American governments. Then came the explanatory article of 1796 which, since it was of later date than the Treaty of San Lorenzo, turned the tables on Spain.[13]

Godoy's resentment at what he regarded as the duplicity of the

[12] See above, note 4, references to Turner and Fugier.

[13] Arthur P. Whitaker, Godoy's Knowledge of the Terms of Jay's Treaty, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXV. 804–810. See also Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty* (Baltimore, 1926), pp. 333–335, 348.

American government was sharpened by personal pique. Posing as a man of broad general culture and eager to prove himself abreast of the fashionable thought of the times, he found it difficult to squeeze much of the current liberalism into the narrow framework of Spanish orthodoxy and identified himself rather with the romantic school. His private letters to the king and queen abound in noble thoughts, the jargon of sentiment, and echoes of the cult of nature. He spoke of himself as a man of "sensibility", and on one occasion, when he felt that he no longer fully enjoyed the king's confidence, wrote the queen that he was about to retire to his private estate, where, he said, "solitude and crumbling walls shall be my delight". He carried out the plan, and some months later wrote, again to the queen: "Given up to solitude, I am surrounded by books in which I am reminded of the lives of men who have been useful to their country and whose lessons teach me how to live." [14]

Such a man would naturally share the widespread romantic belief that the Americans, nurtured in the ennobling solitude of the New World, were a singularly virtuous people, and therefore most deserving; and Godoy seems to have shared it to the full, until he was enlightened by experience. Though he had read reams of dispatches from the governors of Louisiana which described the western Americans as predatory semi-savages, he was sure that these backwoodsmen were not representative of the mass of their countrymen, who lived on the Atlantic coast and were, as every European philosopher knew, an amiable and upright race. As recently as 1794 his esteem for the American people had been strengthened by dispatches from the Spanish agents at Philadelphia telling him how the United States government had befriended Spain by breaking up Genêt's expeditions against Louisiana. To a Spaniard such conduct would naturally indicate the possession of moral qualities of a high order. So it was that, though Godoy's predecessors had taken a more realistic view of American character and policy and though he himself was soon to return to that view, in 1795 he still held the romantic opinion of the United States once prevalent in France. When he negotiated the Treaty of San Lorenzo with the American minister, Thomas Pinckney, he seems to have regarded himself as a second Vergennes patronizing simple republican virtue; but he suffered a Vergennes's disillusionment, for as Franklin was followed by Adams and Jay, so Pinckney soon gave way to Pickering and Hamilton.

[14] Godoy to the queen, Sept. 26, 1798, Aug. 2, 1799, and May 3, 1801; to the king, Oct. 29, 1798, A.H.N., Est., legajo 2821. This *legajo* contains a valuable series of private letters from Godoy to the king and queen, most of them belonging to the period 1798–1808.

The explanatory article was signed at Philadelphia in May, 1796, by Secretary of State Timothy Pickering for the United States and Phineas Bond for Great Britain. The unwelcome news reached Madrid in September. Though it came direct from Spain's own minister at Philadelphia, Godoy interpreted it in the light of information and advice from Paris. The conclusion he reached was, on the one hand, that the American government's agreement to the article proved its subservience to Great Britain; and, on the other hand, that the American people were devoted to France and indignant at the devious course taken by their Anglophile government. Unwarrantedly confident that he could count upon the whole-hearted support of France, which was egging him on, Godoy determined to have it out with Pitt's minions at Philadelphia.

The result was the issuance of an order dated October 29, 1796, which suspended the execution of the Treaty of San Lorenzo by directing the governor of Louisiana to retain until further notice several posts on the eastern bank of the Mississippi despite the fact that the treaty stipulated their immediate surrender to the United States.[15] It was evidently Godoy's expectation that, in the course of the controversy which his order was sure to provoke, one of two things would happen: the American government would either be forced to give unmistakable proof of its subserviency to Great Britain, whereupon it would be overthrown by the exasperated American people, or else it would have to disavow the explanatory article of May, 1796, in which case the Anglo-American entente would be destroyed. He was highly satisfied with his plan, which seemed a clever way of meeting the crisis caused by the conclusion of the explanatory article and the subsequent outbreak of war between Great Britain and Spain.

A bitter disappointment was in store for him. Since foreign influence in the United States was not decisive, as recent advices from Paris had led him to believe, it was impossible for him to execute the maneuver which he had planned on that assumption. Neither did he create a rift between the people and government of the United States, nor did he destroy the Anglo-American entente, such as it was. On the contrary, his conduct increased the probability of coöperation between the two English-speaking peoples and played into the hands of Spain's worst enemies in the United States—those elements who were soon to rally around Alexander Hamilton in his projected invasion of Spanish America. This danger in turn became one of the chief obstacles to the completion of the Louisiana business.

[15] Article cited in note 13, above.

The other unfavorable development of this distressing winter was Godoy's discovery that, despite the recently concluded treaty of alliance, Spain could expect little aid from France in America. This disillusionment too came in the course of the crisis caused by his order relating to the border posts. France, though partly responsible for that step and consequently for the ensuing controversy with the United States, refused to support Spain when Godoy tardily remembered that it might be well to have a written pledge of such support before going any further. Instead of giving the pledge, unsympathetic Paris declared that the crisis in the court's relations with the United States was merely another proof that Spain ought in self-defense to effect the immediate and gratuitous retrocession of Louisiana.[16] This was the beginning of Godoy's alienation from the Directory, which was to become much more pronounced before the end of the year.

His double disappointment was not followed by any abrupt change of policy toward either France or the United States. His position at court was not so secure that he could afford to defy France, and he was slow to believe that the American people would not repudiate their government at the behest of France and Spain. He still professed himself ready to cede Louisiana to France, and he still refused to let the United States have the border posts on the Mississippi. If we are to believe the French ambassador, Godoy admitted as late as May, 1797, that in its own interests Spain ought to conclude the negotiation on the terms proposed by France, that is, by surrendering Louisiana immediately and without compensation. But the now wary Spaniard had no difficulty in finding pretexts for evading retrocession on any terms. The unenlightened mass of his countrymen, he said, would never tolerate the cession of Louisiana in return for an equivalent which would benefit the royal family alone and not the Spanish people themselves.[17] This was an allusion to the proposed aggrandizement of the House of Parma, which was the compensation ultimately accepted by Charles IV. three years later; but in 1797 the Parma project was open to other objections as well, one of which was that France was not sufficiently strong in Italy to guarantee the execution of its part of the bargain. Since it was even less likely that the French would be able to deliver an equivalent which

[16] Pérignon to Godoy, Jan. 1, 1797, with a marginal note by Godoy dated Jan. 3, 1797, A.H.N., Est., legajo 3891, *expediente* no. 3; Godoy to Pérignon, Jan. 5, 1797, draft, *ibid.*, legajo 3896 *bis*.

[17] Pérignon to the minister of foreign affairs, Aranjuez, May 24, 1797, Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, sup., vol. 7, f. 75; the Prince of the Peace to the French ambassador, Aranjuez, Mar. 11, 1797, copy, *ibid.*, Espagne, sup., vol. 18, f. 114.

would benefit the Spanish people, such as Gibraltar or Newfoundland fishing rights, one gets the impression that Godoy was demanding impossible terms in order to block a negotiation which it would not have been prudent for him to break off. He no longer had any desire to conclude this important business with so unreliable a government as the Directory had proved to be.

In July, 1797, as the result of an upheaval at Paris, Talleyrand took over the French foreign office and with it the tedious Louisiana negotiation. His conduct of it was neither original nor successful. He employed the arguments already elaborated by his predecessors, and the world situation was not such as to make his repetition of their hackneyed phrases convincing. If he took at their face value the protestations of the Spanish court, which was still doing lip service to the French alliance, he probably anticipated success. Godoy, however, liked the reconstructed Directory no better than the old one, and he was very far from being subservient to France. Apropos of the crisis in Franco-American relations which was soon to culminate in the X Y Z affair, he wrote Minister Irujo at Philadelphia in August, 1797, that if France increased its diplomatic pressure on the United States, Spain would do the same; that if France composed its differences with the United States, Spain would not break with the latter power; but that in case France should go to war with the United States, Spain would either join its ally or take the position of mediator, according to its own interests.[18]

The ominous note of independence in the concluding passage of this letter can probably be explained by recent developments which had destroyed Godoy's small remnant of faith in the Directory. During the spring and summer of 1797 France and Great Britain had been engaged in peace negotiations in the course of which some of the French envoys expressed a willingness to give Louisiana to Great Britain in return for British acquiescence in the territorial gains made by France on the Continent. That would have been a gross betrayal of Spain, since from the very beginning of the Louisiana negotiation in 1795 France had promised to maintain the province as a barrier between New Spain and the Anglo-Americans, or, as Talleyrand put it, "a wall of brass forever impenetrable to the combined efforts of England and America". Whether or not the Spanish court knew the full extent of France's perfidy, it was offended and alarmed by the secretiveness of its ally in regard to the negotiation

[18] Letter dated San Ildefonso, Aug. 14, 1797, no. 37 (transcript in the Library of Congress), Archivo del ministerio de estado (Madrid).

with Great Britain.[19] This episode seems to have completed Godoy's alienation from France. At any rate, he was henceforth, whether openly or secretly, the principal opponent of the Directory in Spain.

Talleyrand soon found that the Spanish minister was not made of modeling clay. On September 18, 1797, he took up the threadbare Louisiana negotiation, presenting the court with a carefully prepared memoir on the subject. Besides renewing the demand for Louisiana, on the ground that the Blount conspiracy in the United States and the progress of revolutionary sentiment at New Orleans proved the impossibility of Spain's holding the province much longer, he also urged the court to retain the border posts on the Mississippi until the restoration of general peace in Europe, and in the meanwhile to mollify the Americans by executing the article in the Treaty of San Lorenzo relating to the free navigation of the Mississippi. His eloquence was wasted on Godoy, whose reply evaded the demand for Louisiana and ignored the rest of the memoir.[20] As a matter of fact, Spain had long since executed the article relating to the free navigation of the Mississippi; and as for the disputed border posts, Godoy had just issued the final order for their delivery to the United States.[21] He was not so eager to please France that he would reverse himself for the third time by again ordering their retention.

France's first knowledge of the existence of the order came from the news that the posts had been evacuated. So well had the court kept its own counsel that the information reached Paris by way of the United States, where the French consul general obtained it from a newspaper. Though Godoy, who was responsible for the measure, had been forced out of office by this time, Talleyrand nevertheless protested to Spain against its flagrant disregard of the wishes of its ally. In June, 1798, he presented the court with another memorial, in which he catalogued various French grievances, and among these the surrender of the border posts occupied a prominent place.[22] Saavedra, Godoy's successor, replied

[19] Pérignon to Delacroix, Madrid, July 20, 1797, enclosing a copy of a note from Godoy dated July 19, Arch. Aff. Étr., Espagne, sup., vol. 18, f. 152; Guyot, pp. 409–429.

[20] Draft of a memoir by Talleyrand, Paris, Sept. 18, 1797, Arch. Aff., Espagne, sup., vol. 18, f. 184; memoir by the Prince of the Peace, Sept. 29, 1797, *ibid.*, f. 195.

[21] For the purpose of the present article it is not necessary to inquire into Godoy's reasons for surrendering the posts. This question, together with others alluded to in the text, will be discussed in the forthcoming book mentioned above, note 1.

[22] Talleyrand to Truguet, Apr. 21, 1798, draft, Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, sup., vol. 7, f. 105; report by Talleyrand to the Directory, *ibid.*, Espagne, vol. 652, f. 203. Talleyrand's memorial is in A.H.N., Est., legajo 4018.

through Ambassador Azara, who told Talleyrand that "the treaty which we made with the Colonies [the United States] and the cession of the forts on the left bank of the Mississippi are one of those irremediable errors of policy which it is useless to regret, and we should rather direct our attention to discovering means to correct its ill effects".[23]

If, as one might infer, Azara was here hinting at the possibility of an early cession of Louisiana, he was not following instructions from Madrid, for his government had just informed him in the most unequivocal terms that for the present it would not listen to any proposal relating to the alienation of the province. Late in May, 1798, Azara had informed Saavedra of an interview in which Talleyrand had suggested that France might force Portugal to give Spain a slice of Brazil on condition that Spain should cede Louisiana to France. In support of his proposal Talleyrand had delivered a long disquisition on the uselessness of Louisiana to Spain, asserting that in the present state of affairs England with the aid of the United States was carrying on a vast contraband trade through New Orleans with Mexico and other Spanish possessions on the Gulf, and that he had documents proving that this trade amounted to two million pounds sterling a year. Replying to Azara on June 4, Saavedra rejected the offer unconditionally. "On no account whatever", he wrote, "must the cession of Louisiana, the Floridas, or any other portion of our dominions be involved in the proposed peace with Portugal. These jewels, whether they bring us advantages or disadvantages—and on this point there is a great deal to be said—must in any event be kept for the end of the play when the question of compensations arises. Otherwise we shall be involved in a futile discussion and perhaps also in a disagreeable dispute with the Anglo-Americans [the United States] at a time when we are trying to accommodate existing differences and not to raise new ones."[24]

Though Saavedra disagreed with Godoy on many points, he prudently adhered to his predecessor's policy of conciliating the Americans. This involved the further postponement of the Louisiana negotiation with France, for the Spanish minister at Philadelphia warned his government again and again in 1797 and 1798 that the United States, under the influence of Hamilton, Pickering, and their anti-French associates, would almost certainly go to war rather than permit France to acquire the province. In June of the latter year the imminence of the danger was

[23] Saavedra to Azara, Madrid, July 2, 1798, *ibid.*; Azara to Talleyrand, Paris, July 20, 1798, Arch. Aff. Étr., Espagne, vol. 653, f. 126.

[24] Azara to Saavedra, Paris, May 27, 1798, no. 2; Saavedra to Azara, Aranjuez, June 4, 1798, draft, A.H.N., Est., legajo 4018.

brought home to Saavedra by a startling piece of intelligence which came to him through the French government itself. Reporting another interview with Talleyrand, Azara wrote: "I found him very much disturbed by letters from North America which he was reading. They inform him that Pitt's gold and intrigues have won Congress over, that the plan of campaign is to begin by an attack on Spanish Louisiana and Florida, which they [the United States] expect to take without resistance. . . . This information is authoritative, for Talleyrand showed me the letters of the French consul in Philadelphia, in which he states that the Vice President of Congress [Thomas Jefferson], who is a friend of the French and consequently hostile to the English party, told him of this in great secrecy. Talleyrand assures me that the Directory is determined to leave no stone unturned to avoid this rupture, but that he does not know if they will be in time. He urged me strongly to warn your Excellency of it in order that all possible precautions may be taken; but neither of us knows what they might be."[25]

Talleyrand once more demonstrated his lack of understanding of Spanish policy, for, in the evident expectation that his warning would frighten the court into ceding him the threatened border province, he now sent a new minister to Madrid for the express purpose of obtaining Louisiana. Azara obligingly admitted that Spain derived "fort peu de profit" from the possession of it;[26] but the court knew that, if news of the cession leaked out, it would almost certainly provoke the United States to a war of conquest which would not stop with Louisiana and Florida. Godoy was still determined to get a good price if the cession should be made, and Talleyrand soon found that to drive him from office was not to drive him from power. Harassed by domestic as well as foreign complications, the incompetent Directory was unable to offer Charles IV. sufficient inducement to disregard the advice of his favorite. Even if Spain had been willing to strike a bargain at this time, it was beyond the power of the French to make an acceptable offer. They were not strong enough in Italy to create the desired kingdom for the House of Parma. Gibraltar and Newfoundland fishing rights were even further beyond their grasp. The slice of Brazil which was the one equivalent they might have been able to deliver had been disdainfully rejected by the court. Its motive power exhausted for the time being, the negotiation came to a full stop, and no further progress was made in it for the next two years.

[25] June 19, 1798, dispatch no. 15, *ibid.*

[26] Azara to Talleyrand, Paris, Aug. 10, 1798, Arch. Aff. Étr., Espagne, vol. 653, f. 243.

By June, 1800, the situation had changed completely. Now the Spanish court had an incentive to negotiate and a new and more satisfactory government at Paris to deal with. Napoleon's victorious progress in Italy was reviving the royal family's hope that something might really be done for their cousin of Parma, and in these early days Spain found the Consulate far more congenial than it ever had the Directory. Charles IV. indeed regarded the First Consul with an admiration bordering on hero worship and endeavored to identify himself as closely as possible with the great man, speaking with proprietary pride of the progress of "our arms" in Italy.[27] Spain's reluctance to make the retrocession had abated somewhat since the open break between President Adams and the war party in the United States, which greatly diminished the danger of reprisals in that quarter.

Under these favorable circumstances the Parma negotiation was resumed in April, 1800, but it was not coupled with Louisiana until the latter part of June. That the retrocession project was then revived and linked with Parma was due to the initiative not of France but of Spain. The French government indeed seemed to have forgotten Louisiana, which it was not making any effort to recover at this time.[28] In the early stages the conversations about Parma were conducted through an agent of the Spanish treasury in Paris, José Martínez de Hervas. As late as June 11, Hervas reported the results of long conferences about Parma without even mentioning Louisiana. He had been authorized to pay a bribe of as much as three million dollars for the erection of the Italian kingdom, and, though Charles IV. had never stated his terms precisely, Hervas believed that the business could be arranged to his satisfaction. Talleyrand had said, however, that Spain's terms must be made known at once, since the treaty could not be postponed until the end of the war. "You will observe from this expression", commented Hervas, "that the general peace is not so near at hand as is generally believed, and you will decide whether, in view of the uncertainty of the final result, it is worth while making great sacrifices before the general peace, and whether, in case the arrangement is made now, we are likely to be able to procure its continuance without alteration".

Talleyrand had urged him, said Hervas, to keep the negotiation a profound secret, and to conceal it not only from Múzquiz, the Spanish

27 Fugier, I. 108.

28 At any rate, the writer has not found any evidence of such an effort in the French diplomatic correspondence for January-June, 1800, though he was aided in his search by Mrs. N. M. Miller Surrey's useful *Calendar of Manuscripts in Paris Archives and Libraries relating to the History of the Mississippi Valley to 1803* (Washington, 1926–1928).

ambassador at Paris, but also from Alquier, the French ambassador at Madrid. The Frenchman explained his strange request by asserting that some one close to the Spanish court was abusing its confidence, but the real reason was doubtless his desire to reduce the number of participants in the negotiation in order to increase his own share of the three million dollar *pot de vin* offered by Spain. Though Hervas promised to keep the secret, he immediately communicated it to Múzquiz, for he feared that Talleyrand might try to play a double game.[29]

Hervas's letter was addressed to Mariano Luis de Urquijo, the new Spanish minister for foreign affairs. On June 22 Urquijo replied in two letters, as Hervas had requested, one of them confidential, the other to be shown to Talleyrand. The latter stated that the peace terms desired by Spain extended only to the recovery of Trinidad and Minorca and to a livelihood for the Duke of Parma. The confidential letter approved of Hervas's communicating the secret to Múzquiz, in whom the court had "unlimited confidence" and to whom a copy of the letter was sent; but as for Alquier, said Urquijo, "I will leave him in the most complete ignorance of all this". He then proceeded to introduce Louisiana into the negotiation for the first time, devoting to it a passage which, though lengthy, is of such prime importance for the understanding of Spanish policy that it must be quoted in full.[30] The passage reads:

> I wish to call your attention to only one important point in connection with the general peace. . . . I can never believe that the French will make such sacrifices for us, in spite of its importance to them, as to demand that Minorca and Trinidad be restored to us, although the treaty of alliance stipulates a mutual guaranty of our possessions, without which peace must not be made. Never, I repeat, can I believe that they will have these restored to us free of charge, for the English will interpose a thousand obstacles to it in the general peace, unless we make some sacrifice. You know that the memoirs written by Carnot in Hamburg show that the former Directory thought at one time of demanding Louisiana of us. *Between ourselves, this* [province, Louisiana] *costs us more than it is worth,* and while the cession of it to the

[29] Hervas to Urquijo, two secret letters, both dated Paris, June 11, 1800, one relating to a loan and the other to Parma, A.H.N., Est., legajo 3963. For Hervas's mission to Paris, see Fugier, I. 99–109.

[30] Urquijo to Múzquiz, Aranjuez, June 22, 1800, copy, inclosing copies of the two letters of the same date to Hervas, A.H.N., Est., legajo 3963. Portions of the confidential letter to Hervas have been published in Andrés Muriel, *Historia de Carlos IV.* (Madrid, 1894), VI. 69, 70, and (in French translation) in Fugier, I. 109, but the English translation given in the text of the present article is the first publication of the whole passage relating to Louisiana. The italics are inserted. Henry Adams, whose book was published five years before Muriel's, was apparently unaware of the existence of the letter. Muriel accepts it as a sincere statement of Spanish policy (as does Fugier), but argues that Urquijo was mistaken in saying that Louisiana cost Spain more than it was worth.

French is open to the objection that they would use it to carry on a smuggling trade with Mexico, the English are already doing so by means of the Americans; and it would be a great advantage to us to interpose between the latter and ourselves a barrier against their ambitious plans of conquest, especially if that barrier were raised by such a nation as France, which has neither an active colonizing spirit nor, in view of its absorption in European affairs, the resources for colonization. *Above all, I repeat, this would be an advantage to us because of the recent treaty* [the Treaty of San Lorenzo] *by which we granted the free navigation of the Mississippi and the principal points that served us as a barrier to the Gulf of Mexico—a concession the ultimate consequences of which you can foresee.* Therefore I say that if the French arrange a peace for us in which we obtain Trinidad and Minorca and the House of Parma obtains, in addition to its present possessions, the Legations, Modena, and Reggio or the Milanese, we could not only give the three millions to B[onaparte] and T[alleyrand] but also Louisiana and many thanks into the bargain, and we could flatter ourselves that such a treaty had never before been obtained. But this must be understood for the general peace, since otherwise the Americans, who know how important it is that Louisiana should remain in our hands, would prevent the cession and transfer and would even go to the point of declaring war on us, as they have already threatened to do on another occasion when they suspected it [the retrocession of Louisiana], and nothing would be accomplished but to turn the world upside down again and expose us to a mortal blow in the Americas. On the other hand, if this were arranged at the general peace, the Americans would find themselves without any power to aid them in their designs.

That Urquijo was writing in all sincerity can hardly be questioned, for the letter was a highly confidential communication addressed to trusted agents in a secret negotiation. His statement of policy is important for two reasons: first, because it contains an explicit recognition of the fact that the Treaty of San Lorenzo, by making Spain's position in Louisiana untenable, was directly responsible for the retrocession; and second, because it disposes conclusively of the assumption that Napoleon extorted the retrocession from a reluctant Spanish court. When, several weeks later, Napoleon spoiled Talleyrand's game by putting the negotiation in Alquier's hands and the latter presented his abrupt demand for Louisiana,[31] it was only natural that Urquijo should reply, "Eh! Who told you that I would not give it to you?" Since he himself had violated Talleyrand's injunction of secrecy by informing Múzquiz of the negotiation in progress through Hervas, he would naturally assume that the French government had communicated it to Alquier. Misunderstanding the motive behind Talleyrand's request, he had taken this step as a protection against double-dealing on the part of France; and he had no

[31] Alquier's report of the interview is in Arch. Aff. Étr., Espagne, vol. 659, ff. 244–247, dispatch no. 53, San Ildefonso, Aug. 7, 1800. France's reasons for shifting the negotiation from Paris to Madrid, thus eliminating Hervas, do not fall within the scope of this paper.

reason to believe that Talleyrand had neglected to take similar precautions against Spanish finesse. His reply to Alquier expressed not submission to French bullying, but surprise that the French ambassador could be so ill informed as to think bullying necessary.

It is true that Urquijo was finally forced to accept less favorable terms than those which he had proposed at the outset; but that is the common lot of negotiators. The most important concession that Napoleon got from him was his consent to the immediate settlement of the question, whereas Urquijo wished to postpone it to the general peace. Even this concession, however, was not the result of spineless submission, for the treaty was framed in such a way as to meet the principal objections which he had urged against it. These objections were that if the Americans learned of the retrocession, they might go to war to defeat it, and that the prospect of general peace was so remote and the final success of France so problematical that Spain might never receive the price of Louisiana. The first objection was obviated by keeping the treaty secret, and the second by making it contingent—for it was provided that Louisiana should not actually be delivered to France until the House of Parma had been put in full possession of the benefits stipulated in the treaty.

Much as Godoy disliked Urquijo and distrusted France, he could not withhold his approval of the retrocession. It was not merely as a supple courtier that he spoke in favor of it. No one knew better than he the ardent desire of the king and queen to promote the welfare of the closely related House of Parma, but that alone might not have been enough, for Godoy had shown more than once that he could speak his mind quite freely to them. It was at this very time that he dared to raise his voice against the chorus of adulation with which the court, echoing the king and queen, was hailing Napoleon. "Well, Manuel", said Charles on the morrow of Marengo, "what do you think of Bonaparte?" "Sire", replied the imperturbable Godoy, "we must wait and see how Bonaparte ends. What has happened is a great misfortune for these poor Italians."[32] If on the present occasion he gave his royal masters the counsel they desired, it was probably because he believed the arrangement was advantageous to Spain. It must not be forgotten that he was committed to the principle of retrocession by the treaty which he himself had signed in 1796, and which had failed of adoption only because the Directory refused

[32] Alquier to Talleyrand, Madrid, July 3, 1800, deciphered copy, *ibid.*, ff. 133–134. Although Alquier was an unreliable gossip, this story is probably true, for Godoy's private letters to the king and queen (see above, n. 14) show that the favorite's technique consisted of a judicious mixture of flattery and plain speaking.

to pay his price. If the compensation about to be accepted was one which would benefit the royal family alone and not the nation, the change was justified by altered circumstances, for by 1800 it was evident that France could deliver a kingdom in Italy and could not deliver Gibraltar and fishing rights.

He approached the negotiation of 1800 in the same bargaining spirit when his advice was sought by the king. His written reply,[33] which took the form of answers to a questionnaire, lends further support to the thesis that by this time Louisiana was regarded by the Spanish court simply as a piece of merchandise, or, if one prefers, as a diplomatic pawn. There were eleven questions. To ten of them he returned answers which were decidedly favorable to the proposed retrocession. Did Spain derive any advantage from Louisiana? No, he replied. Spanish merchants, who rarely ventured to New Orleans, were coldly received when they did go there; and Louisiana had never repaid the Spanish treasury for the cost of its government, and probably would not do so for a long time to come. Would Louisiana be useful to Spain for the protection of Mexico? If well defended by numerous troops it would doubtless serve as a convenient outpost, but it was not essential for that purpose. Would Louisiana in the hands of France be a valuable barrier between New Spain and the United States? Yes, for Spain could count upon the effective coöperation of France in America after the cession. And so on. But to the eleventh question—Was the price offered by France high enough?—he answered roundly, No! Spain must have assurance that the succession to the Italian kingdom would be vested in the Spanish dynasty, that Spanish commerce with Louisiana would be given preferential treatment, and that France would never alienate Louisiana. This closefisted son of Extremadura was a born bargainer. Though he could not completely stifle his distrust of the French, neither could he resist the temptation to haggle with them over the sale of a province which was no longer of any use to Spain.

The ingenuous king did not share Godoy's suspicions, and after the

[33] Manuel Godoy, *Cuenta dada de su vida política* (Madrid, 1909), III. 53–62. This is the Spanish version of Godoy's well-known memoirs, which have also been published in French and English. The present writer has not found the original manuscript of his opinion on the treaty, but that is not surprising, since his subsequent arrest and exile led to the disappearance of many of his papers. There seems to be no good reason to doubt the authenticity of the report, which is not questioned by Henry Adams. In the first place, if it were a fabrication, Godoy would probably have sought to make it more creditable to himself by pretending that he had opposed the retrocession unconditionally. In the second place, as stated in the text, the report is in harmony with his policy as set forth in documents of unquestionable authenticity.

failure of Napoleon's eleventh-hour effort to make Spain give him Florida as well as Louisiana, the treaty was concluded at San Ildefonso (October 1, 1800), without the safeguards recommended by his favorite.[34] However regrettable from the point of view of the Bourbons, the omission was fortunate for Godoy, since it stamped the treaty as the work of Urquijo and made it easier for the favorite to procure the dismissal of his rival from office, as he did less than three months later. Yet Urquijo had not done his work so badly. As already stated, the treaty was a secret one and it made the cession of Louisiana contingent upon the previous establishment and recognition of the Italian kingdom. The total consideration given by Spain—this included, besides Louisiana, six ships of the line and the bribe for Napoleon and Talleyrand—was not disproportionately large. In effect, the king was giving up a colony of fifty thousand inhabitants on the Mississippi in order that his son-in-law might have a kingdom of a million inhabitants on the Arno; and if the cession of Louisiana meant the abandonment of Charles III.'s expansionist policy in North America, it also meant the resumption of the far more venerable Spanish policy of aggrandizement in Italy. If it be objected that this operation despoiled the Spanish empire for the benefit of the House of Bourbon, we need only recall that the colonies in America were the property not of the Spanish nation but of the crown, and that, as Urquijo said,[35] Louisiana, in view of the mode of its acquisition, was more completely at the king's personal disposal than any of the rest of his dominions. Whether we consider the question from the national or the dynastic point of view, it can hardly be denied that Spain's experience with Louisiana justified the alienation of the province—and the justification was even greater in 1800 than when Godoy agreed to part with it in 1796.[36] When Urquijo said that it "costs us more than it is worth", he erred, if at all, on the side of understatement. Louisiana was not only an expensive luxury but had actually become a heavy liability, and Urquijo might well consider it an achievement that he had persuaded France to pay for the privilege of having the burden transferred to its shoulders. There is no more indication of Spanish subservience in the terms of the treaty than in the manner of its negotiation.

It is true that in the interval between the conclusion of the Treaty of

[34] The text has been published several times. Perhaps it can be consulted most conveniently in Renaut, pp. 217–218.

[35] Urquijo to Berthier, San Ildefonso, Sept. 16, 1800, Arch. Aff. Étr., États-Unis, sup., vol. 7, ff. 144–151.

[36] This point is developed at length in the book mentioned above, note 1. *Cf.* Channing, IV. 310–311.

San Ildefonso and the delivery of Louisiana to France three years later there are evidences of Spanish reluctance and French intimidation, and perhaps Adams read these back into the negotiation of 1800. Spain's reluctance, however, still arose not from attachment to Louisiana but from the growing suspicion that France would not pay the full purchase price; and French intimidation was made easier by the Peace of Amiens in the spring of 1802. As long as the war lasted, France was restrained from abusing Charles IV.'s abundant good nature by the fear that if the Spaniards were pushed too far they would make a separate peace with England. That restraint was removed by the Peace of Amiens, and Napoleon immediately gave Spain to understand that Louisiana would have to be handed over to him whether he kept his part of the agreement or not. When hostilities broke out again between France and England a year later, Spain did not have the same advantage as in the earlier war, for the court's eagerness to remain at peace was well known to Napoleon, who made the most of his knowledge. So it was that even though Napoleon, violating his treaty obligations, withheld the purchase price, and, breaking his pledge not to alienate Louisiana, sold it to the United States, Spain nevertheless transferred the province to his representative on November 30, 1803, in the face of the certainty that France in turn would deliver it to the United States.[37]

Even in these later phases of the negotiation it was evident that Spain had little or no desire to keep Louisiana. It is not surprising that this was so, for once more Spanish policy was completely dominated by Godoy. Soon tiring of the delights of solitude and crumbling walls, he returned to court and in December, 1800, obtained Urquijo's dismissal and the appointment of his own henchman and relative, Pedro Cevallos, as secretary of state for foreign affairs. Committed as he was to the retrocession of Louisiana, Godoy was not the man to undo the work of San Ildefonso. He soon showed what might be expected of him on that score, for on March 21, 1801, he and Lucien Bonaparte signed the Con-

[37] The transfer of Louisiana to France took place at New Orleans on November 30, 1803. The Spanish commissioners appointed to effect it had not received any orders on the subject from the court since the sale of Louisiana by France; but, informed that the United States would seize the province by force if Spain attempted to keep it, they assumed the responsibility of delivering it to France under the authority conferred on them by the royal order of October 15, 1802, which is mentioned in the text. Before the court learned what they had done, Cevallos ordered the transfer to be completed, writing the captain general of Florida on January 14, 1804, as follows: "The king has decided to renounce all right to protest against the sale of Louisiana made by France to the United States of America, and it is therefore his royal will that you direct the commissioners for the delivery of the said province to execute it without any protest whatever" (Archivo de Indias, Seville, Papeles de Cuba, legajo 1737).

vention of Aranjuez, which confirmed the existing agreement with regard to Louisiana.[38] It is true that a few months later, in a moment of exasperation at Napoleon's misconduct in regard to Parma, he said to the queen in a private letter, "The French forced us to give them Louisiana, but we ought to draw back, reject their demands, regard the treaties as annulled, and return to the situation that existed before the revolution";[39] but it was a patent absurdity for the man who had voluntarily revived the Louisiana negotiation in 1795, signed a treaty of retrocession in 1796, approved of retrocession in 1800 and confirmed it in 1801, now to speak of the sale of Louisiana as if it had been a rape. If his history was bad, his counsel was worse—so bad, indeed, that he can hardly have meant it to be taken seriously. He wrote apparently not as an official submitting a studied opinion to his queen, but as a man of sensibility unburdening himself to an intimate friend. However that may be, the cause of his irritation was not the loss of Louisiana but the miscarriage of his plans for Parma.

Since even men of sensibility may have sober second thoughts, Godoy wisely contented himself with seeking to obtain the guaranties which he had recommended in 1800. Here he met with some success. Among other things, he persuaded the French government to promise through its ambassador (July, 1802) that it would never alienate Louisiana. The pledge was dearly bought, however, for in return Spain had to agree to execute the cession without waiting for France to perform its treaty obligations in regard to the Italian kingdom. Accordingly the king issued an order dated October 15, 1802, directing the governor of Louisiana to deliver the province to Napoleon's representative.

When war clouds began to gather again early in 1803, it was too late for the court to retrace its steps. Godoy for one had no desire to do so, for just at this time occurred an incident which gave fresh proof that Louisiana was a heavy liability to Spain. In October, 1802, the American deposit at New Orleans was closed under secret orders from the king. The loss of this valuable institution provoked a great outburst of indignation throughout the United States, which was of course reported at once by Minister Irujo. By the beginning of March, 1803, the court knew that it must either immediately restore the deposit, though the privilege had been scandalously abused by the Americans, or else prepare for a ruinous war with the United States. Never was the utter untenability

[38] Fugier, I. 129; Renaut, pp. 259–260. Adams erroneously states that the sixth article of this convention "provided that the retrocession of Louisiana should at once be carried out" (*op. cit.*, I. 372).

[39] Godoy to the queen, Madrid, Oct. 11, 1801, A.H.N., Est., legajo 2821.

of Spain's position in Louisiana more strikingly demonstrated, for Spanish interests and Spanish pride made it impossible to accept either alternative. As a stop-gap measure, orders were sent to New Orleans by way of the United States directing the immediate reopening of the deposit; and then, publicly washing his hands of Louisiana, Godoy informed the American minister, Charles Pinckney, who was trying to buy New Orleans for his government, that France was now the owner of Louisiana and the Americans would have to do their business at Paris. "I never dared to give this reply before", Godoy told the queen, "but on this occasion it was absolutely necessary to do so."[40]

Officially communicated to Pinckney by Secretary Cevallos, this disclaimer of Spanish sovereignty over Louisiana proved most useful to the United States in the subsequent controversy over the validity of the Louisiana Purchase; but it is unlikely that Godoy ever regretted giving it. When, just after the purchase, it was believed at court that Spain could recover Louisiana by ceding the Floridas to the United States and he was advised to seize the opportunity, he coolly rejected the proposal. "There is a good deal of difference of opinion on this subject", he said, "and not everyone gives so much preference to Louisiana." The defensive expansion of the empire in the preceding reign had been too ambitious. It soon became necessary to surrender some of the ground thus gained, and all the circumstances decreed that Spain's possessions in the Mississippi Valley should be chosen for the sacrifice. The Treaty of San Lorenzo marked the beginning of this retreat, which was continued in the inevitable sequel, Spain's withdrawal from Louisiana.

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

Cornell University.

[40] Godoy to the queen, Apr. 30, 1803, *ibid.*

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

Commercial Activities of Silas Deane in France

An important phase of the American Revolution was the economic situation set up by the disruption of normal trade between Great Britain and her rebellious colonies. The necessity of securing supplies to carry on a war when the regular channels of commerce were closed created a serious problem. The French court, fearing that America might be subdued before the difficulty could be remedied, sent Caron de Beaumarchais as observer to London, and here he met Arthur Lee, agent of the Continental Congress. During the early months of 1776 Beaumarchais and Lee effected an agreement whereby military supplies were to be sent clandestinely to America by the French government.[1] On March 3, 1776, Congress appointed Silas Deane their agent and dispatched him to France. His duties were to purchase commercial supplies, especially for the Indian trade, to obtain from the government arms and clothing for 25,000 troops, and to sound the ministers on the question of American independence. His mission was thus partly diplomatic and partly commercial, but in public he assumed the guise of a commercial agent and his talents lay in that direction. This discussion deals with the enterprises through which he sought to profit by his position, some of which had little or no relation to his duties as commercial agent.[2]

Deane soon learned that Beaumarchais was to be the intermediary between himself and the Comte de Vergennes, French minister of foreign affairs; and it was through this channel that the supplies promised to Arthur Lee were furnished. Besides Beaumarchais, there were other agents who served Vergennes in his relations with Deane, the most im-

[1] Arthur Lee to Committee of Foreign Affairs, Oct. 6, 1777, British Museum, Auckland Papers, Additional MSS., 34413–34414, to be found in B. F. Stevens, *Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives relating to America, 1773–1783*, no. 271 (hereinafter referred to by the facsimile number); Richard Henry Lee, *Life of Arthur Lee* (Boston, 1829), I. 54–55; Barbeu Dubourg to Franklin, June 10, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 4th ser., VI. 771–782. There is a considerable literature on this subject. For the most recent discussion, see Lyon G. Tyler, Arthur Lee, a Neglected Statesman, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine, XIV*. (April, 1933) 198–216.

[2] Deane to Committee of Secret Correspondence, Aug. 18, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 5th ser., I. 1011–1021; same to same, Dec. 3, 1776, *ibid.*, III. 1050–1051; Arthur Lee to Secret Committee, Dec. 31, 1776, *ibid.*, III. 1504.

portant among them being his secretary Conrade Gérard, later French minister to America; M. le Rey de Chaumont, a gentleman of large affairs and a government contractor of note; and M. Ferdinand and Sir George Grand, bankers of Paris and Amsterdam, respectively. In addition to these influential men, there were commercial houses in all the important trade centers of France which acted as agents for Chaumont, and, through him, for Deane. Though Deane's original instructions directed him to another banker, Ferdinand Grand was soon handling his affairs.[3]

The connections of the group of speculators with whom Deane dealt were wider than the boundaries of France. Benjamin Franklin was a member of the congressional committee of secret correspondence which had sent Deane to Europe, and he had written Deane's instructions. Before the Revolution Franklin had resided for years in London as agent of several colonies and as a promoter of the gigantic Vandalia land scheme. When he quit England in 1775, therefore, he left behind many friends and associates in the Vandalia enterprise, among them Thomas Walpole, a great London banker and member of Parliament, and Dr. Edward Bancroft, an adventurer from Connecticut who had settled in London and achieved some reputation as a physician and naturalist, and on whom Franklin directed Deane to call for assistance. In addition to Chaumont the French capitalist, Samuel Wharton, Thomas Hutchins, and other of Franklin's friends and associates in the Vandalia company were now to engage in the commercial enterprises of Silas Deane.

Robert Morris, while not a member of the land company, was a member of the committee of secret correspondence and intimately associated with Franklin and Deane. As a partner in the Philadelphia firm of Willing, Morris, and Company, he was one of the most important merchants in America. There were many manufactures which could not be adequately supplied to the American armies except from Great Britain, and, realizing the possibilities in the situation, Morris in the fall of 1776 proposed to Deane the organization of a company with a capital of £400,000, the object of which was to carry on trade between the enemies. The project was to include Thomas Walpole and a group of London merchants, Grand the banker, and Chaumont and a group of French merchants, in addition to Morris and his American associates.

[3] Deane to C. W. F. Dumas, July 26, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 5th ser., I. 589–590; Deane to John Jay, Dec. 3, 1776, *ibid.*, III. 1051–1052; *The Complete Works of Benjamin Franklin*, John Bigelow, ed. (New York, 1904), VII. 338, n.

Goods were to be shipped from England to Dunkirk and Ostend; from here they were to be conveyed to Havre, Nantes, and other French ports, and thence to America in armed French ships carrying both French and American papers. These vessels would be able to get almost to the entrance of American ports without molestation, and they were not to try to enter unless the coast was clear. Furthermore, no arms or ammunition were to be included in the cargoes. This arrangement was carried into effect, and there is every reason to believe that it was successful.[4] It is of interest here primarily because of the connection it proves to have existed between Walpole, Morris, Deane, Chaumont, and their associates.

In one of his early letters to the committee of secret correspondence, Beaumarchais stated that five American ships laden with salt fish had arrived in a French port; that they were not admissible under existing laws, but that he was able to remove all difficulties upon Deane's stating that they were consigned to himself. The business was carried through in this manner.[5] The government was backing the merchant-playwright and the Connecticut Yankee at King Louis' Court was on the inside track. The situation had enormous commercial possibilities, and it is not unlikely that Vergennes got his share of the profits.

Meanwhile, the Declaration of Independence having been proclaimed, Congress decided to send a more formidable mission to France to negotiate treaties of amity and commerce. Benjamin Franklin, Arthur Lee, and Silas Deane were designated as the commissioners. On December 12, 1776, Deane was notified of Franklin's arrival in France, and Lee, still in London, was instructed to join them. The change in organization contemplated a separation of diplomatic affairs from purely commercial matters; and Thomas Morris, brother to Robert, was to be the commercial agent of the secret committee, while the three commissioners were to report to the committee on foreign affairs.[6] In practice, however, the separation was not adhered to. Franklin's reputation added great weight to the American mission, and all its business henceforth revolved about him, while Deane did most of the actual work. Chaumont took these two under his wing and housed them upon his own premises at Passy. Dr. Bancroft, now acting as Deane's secretary—and at the same

[4] Intelligence from Paul Wentworth, Nov. 23, 1776, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 131; Deane to Morris, Apr. 11, 1777, Robert Morris MSS., Library of Congress.

[5] Beaumarchais to Committee of Secret Correspondence, Aug. 18, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 5th ser., I. 1021–1023.

[6] Secret Committee to Thomas Morris, Oct. 25, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 5th ser., II. 1237; Deane to Robert Morris, Dec. 12, 1776, Robert Morris MSS.

time as a spy in the pay of the British government—lived with his American patrons at Passy whenever he was in France.[7]

The question of privateering had interested Deane from the time of his arrival. Certain Frenchmen of great influence encouraged him in it and he urged Congress to send him blank commissions for armed ships, and to authorize the seizure of Portuguese vessels which, he said, would please Spain. Refusing the latter, Congress acceded to the former request. Vessels were now fitted out by Deane and his associates, and prizes brought into French ports. They could not be sold openly here, but it was done clandestinely with the connivance of government officials.[8] Thomas Morris had proved himself a decidedly unsteady young man, and Franklin and Deane took the occasion to establish Jonathan Williams, a nephew of Franklin, in his place at Nantes. To him all the prize business of that port was consigned. Williams also formed a commercial partnership with Deane, and became the agent of Chaumont for certain purchases on account of Congress. He received large sums of money from the commissioners for which he was not required to account. He was thus the pivot of an intricate financial system through which Congress drew quantities of supplies. A commodious warehouse was furnished him at Nantes where vessels could be loaded and unloaded with great privacy. The prizes which were brought in were usually sold to merchants who were agents of Chaumont, and the prices they paid were often far below the actual value.[9] The prize money was in the custody of Chaumont, and John Paul Jones at one time had much difficulty in securing for his crew their share of the booty. Even Franklin

[7] Dr. Bancroft's information of the mission of Silas Deane to the French Court, Aug. 14, 1776, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 890; memorandum by Paul Wentworth, information partly secured from Mr. Edwards (Bancroft), Nov. 16, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 306; Wentworth to Suffolk, Nov. 16, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 218; Petition of Edward Bancroft, Sept. 16, 1784, Library of Congress, British transcripts, F. O. 4, vol. 3, pp. 189–192; Lee, *Arthur Lee*, I. 366–367; Samuel Flagg Bemis, British Secret Service and the French-American Alliance, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXIX. 474–495.

[8] Deane to Morris, Sept. 17, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 5th ser., II. 361; Deane to Secret Committee, Oct. 1, 1776, *ibid.*, II. 809–812; Committee of Foreign Affairs to Franklin, Deane, and Lee, Dec. 21, 1776, *ibid.*, III. 1328; Lee, *Arthur Lee*, I. 337, 342; Wentworth to Suffolk, June 10, July 17, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, nos. 170, 182; Arthur Lee to R. H. Lee, Oct. 4, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 269.

[9] Deane to Morris, Aug. 23, Sept. 25, 1777, Robert Morris MSS.; Thomas Morris to Jonathan Williams, Dec. 5, 1777, *ibid.*; James Moylan to Stephen Moylan, Dec. 10, 1777, *ibid.*; Jonathan Williams to Deane, Oct. 21, 1777, Lee MSS., University of Virginia library; Wm. Lee to R. H. Lee, Nov. 24, 1777, Arthur Lee MSS., Harvard University library; Geo. Lupton to Wm. Eden, Sept. 23, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 199; Jonathan Williams to John Holker, Feb. 11, 1779, Holker MSS. in possession of Mr. William S. Mason, Evanston, Ill.

apparently was powerless to help him.[10] As purchasing agents for Congress, Chaumont and Williams bought a considerable part of the captured goods which, as prize agents, they sold to their own associates, and Congress was charged the high prices prevailing in America because of depreciated paper, but paid in tobacco or other commodities on a specie basis. Franklin was later told that a profit of twenty-fivefold was usual as a result of such operations, and that as much as eightyfold—eight thousand per cent—had been realized.[11]

While Deane's associates were engaged in these commercial ventures, certain of them kept up their interest in the imperial ambitions of the Vandalia Company. In 1778 Thomas Hutchins published in London his *Topographical Description of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and North Carolina,* and a map of the western parts of these states. After he left London, another edition was brought out in Paris in 1781. Hutchins was a native of New Jersey who had been trained as an engineer and had seen considerable service in the British army in that capacity. In connection with the Vandalia interests, he had explored and mapped much of the western country in America.[12] During the years under review he resided in London, retained his commission in the army, engaged in the publication of his work, and kept in touch with Samuel Wharton, also a member of the land company. Wharton was of a Quaker family of Philadelphia, and he was at this time in London endeavoring, chiefly through the Vandalia Company, to bolster the failing fortunes of his one-time important mercantile house.

While thus retaining their interest in American lands, this group had other business more pressing and apparently more profitable. In Paris, Deane was in touch with the most authoritative sources of information on French and American plans for war and for peace, and this information had high economic value. In order to make the most of it, Deane communicated it, either directly or through Bancroft, to Samuel Wharton in London who was instructed to buy and sell stocks on the London Exchange in accordance with the information furnished. When news

[10] John Paul Jones to Franklin, Mar. 3, 1780, Library of Congress, Papers of the Continental Congress, no. 193, ff. 5, 73, 77, 89.

[11] Wentworth to [Suffolk], Oct. 17, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles,* no. 274; document in the hand of Paul Wentworth, *ca.* Oct. 21, 1777, *ibid.,* no. 277; R. H. Lee [?] to Arthur Lee, May 23, 1779, Lee MSS., Harvard; S. Wharton to John Brown, Mar. 23, 1781, *ibid.;* A. Gillon to Stripps and Mey, June [ ], 1780, *ibid.;* Arthur Lee, *Observations on Certain Commercial Transactions in France* (Philadelphia, 1780), pamphlet in the Library of Congress, pp. 7 ff.; J. Ingenhousz to Franklin, June 11, 1785, Franklin MSS., American Philosophical Society, XXXIII. 133.

[12] Frederick Charles Hicks, *Thomas Hutchins* (Cleveland, 1904), *passim.*

of the victory of Saratoga reached Paris, Bancroft traveled express to London for the purpose of speculating upon the event.[13] It is impossible to say how many people were concerned in these speculations, but Walpole, Paul Wentworth—Bancroft's intermediary and an efficient British spy—and John Williams, who like Franklin was an uncle of Jonathan Williams of Nantes, had a part in them, and Williams as well as Wentworth was also engaged in selling to the British government American information that came through Wharton.[14] Another opportunity of utilizing inside information was in connection with marine insurance. Joseph Wharton, brother to Samuel, offered a partnership in this line of endeavor to Dr. Bancroft in exchange for secret service. Franklin was privy to some of these speculations.[15]

Lord North and the British ministry were informed of these transactions and in March, 1779, Samuel Wharton decided that it was no longer safe to remain in London. He consequently took his departure for Paris and joined the congenial little circle which surrounded Franklin and Chaumont at Passy. His duties in London were now taken over by Hutchins, who carried on the correspondence with Wharton, supplied "hartshorn for the stocks" and made the speculations upon 'Change.[16] This would seem to have been a very hazardous business for him because of his commission in the British army and the efficient spy service which that government maintained in London. For several months, however, his work went on uninterrupted. Then, in September, 1779, his quarters were raided, his papers seized, and he was for a short time imprisoned. For some reason he was set free and left the City, giving it

[13] S. Wharton to Bancroft, July 29, 1777, British transcripts, S. P., Dom., George III., bundle 12, p. 23; *ibid.*, C. O. 5, vol. 38, p. 107; Wentworth to Eden, Dec. 11, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 225; same to same, Dec. 22, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 234; same to same [ ], 1777, *ibid.*, no. 324; Samuel Wharton to Deane, Feb. 21, Mar. 13, 1778, British Museum, Additional MSS., 24321.

[14] Bancroft to J. Williams, London, Oct. 31, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 286; Bancroft to Thomas Walpole, received Nov. 3, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 289; Bancroft to S. Wharton, Nov. 3, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 290; Bentley to Carmichael, Nov. 8, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 294; [J. Williams] to Bancroft, Nov. 18, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 307; John Vardill to Wm. Eden, Nov. 28, 1777, *ibid.*, nos. 310–311; Wharton to [Bancroft], May 22, 1778, Franklin MSS., Am. Phil. Soc., XLVII. 116; Lewis Einstein, *Divided Loyalties* (New York, 1933), p. 9.

[15] Bancroft to Franklin, Mar. 4, 1777, Franklin MSS., Am. Phil. Soc., V. 89; Lee to Franklin and Adams, Feb. 7, 1779, *ibid.*, XIII. 86; [J. W(harton)], London, to Bancroft, Nov. 10, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 301; Digges to Lee, Aug. 30, 1778, Lee MSS., Harvard; Bancroft to Franklin, Sept. 14, 1778, *ibid.*

[16] Papers found at Hutchins's lodgings, May 5–Sept. 7, 1779, Library of Congress transcripts, C. O. 5, vol. 7; P. Drouillard to Hutchins, Mar. 20, 1780, Hutchins MSS., II., Historical Society of Pennsylvania; Samuel Wharton to John Almon, Mar. 20, 1779, B. M., Add. MSS., 20733.

out that he was going to Wales for his health. At the same time he proposed to sell his commission in the army. Permission to do so was refused and he was ordered to embark for Jamaica with his regiment. He neither went to Wales nor joined his regiment, but made his way to France where Franklin furnished him with letters to Congress. In due time he reached Philadelphia, presented his credentials, and became Geographer of the United States.[17]

The relations between Arthur Lee, now one of the commissioners, and Deane had never been entirely cordial. While Deane was serving alone in Paris and Lee was still in London, the latter decided to pay a visit to the French capital. Upon his approach, Deane wrote to Vergennes that the presence of the Virginian was not needed and he hoped his services might be dispensed with. Lee went back to London and apparently caused no more inconvenience until he was appointed one of the three commissioners. During the spring of 1777 he was sent off to Prussia largely to get him out of the way, and it was during his absence that Jonathan Williams was given the commercial agency at Nantes in the place of Thomas Morris, the appointee of Congress.[18] When Lee returned, he objected to this unwarranted assumption of authority, but, wishing to avoid an open break, did not push his objections.

Williams was in the habit of receiving orders from Deane alone; and Grand, the banker to the commission, was in the habit of honoring drafts which only Deane had signed. Lee objected to both these practices also, but to no avail. Franklin gave Lee plainly to understand that his signature was not necessary, and finally settled the matter by writing to Williams that though he himself had not signed the orders sent him by Deane, he approved of them, and that Williams would have been justified in his actions even had he received no orders at all. Thus Lee was ignored by Franklin and Deane as far as it was possible for them to do so, and the work of the commission came to be carried on without his coöperation.[19]

[17] Thomas Hutchins to Franklin, Feb. 27, 1780, miscellaneous MSS., William S. Mason Collection; V. I. Bertrand to Franklin, Sept. 14, 1779, Franklin MSS., Am. Phil. Soc., XV. 167; Edward Williams to "Monsieur Chevalier", Feb. 22, 1780, Hutchins MSS., III., Hist. Soc. of Pa.; Edward Williams to Mons. P. Steptoe, Mar. 13, 1780, *ibid.*; Bigelow, *Franklin*, VIII. 203–204; *Journals of the Continental Congress*, Gaillard Hunt, ed., XIX. 187, XX. 475–476, 738.

[18] Deane to Vergennes, Aug. 22, 1776, Force, *American Archives*, 5th ser., I. 1105; Bancroft to Wentworth, Apr. 24, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 65.

[19] Franklin to Jonathan Williams, Dec. 22, 1777, Bigelow, *Franklin*, XII. 338; Franklin to Lee, May 17, 1778, *ibid.*, VII. 300–301; Lee to Franklin and Deane, Jan. 10, 1778, Lee MSS., Harvard; Wm. Stevenson to Arthur Lee, Feb. 1, 1778, Lee MSS., Univ. of Virginia.

Though Lee, out of consideration for the public interest, had avoided an open break in spite of numerous indignities heaped upon him by his colleagues, it was finally brought about through the instrumentality of John Thornton. At the end of 1777, this person was employed by the commissioners to go to London in the interest of American prisoners.[20] This mission brought him in contact with Samuel and Joseph Wharton and with the British ministry. Early in January, 1778, he wrote to the commissioners stating that on January 3 Lord North had told David Hartley he understood Bancroft had been sent to London on stock-jobbing business by Franklin, Deane, and Lee.[21] This letter was kept a secret from Lee by the other two commissioners, and on Thornton's return to Paris, Franklin recommended him to Lee as a secretary. Lee accepted his services and sent him back to London to gather information on the British navy. On his return to London, Thornton again sought the Whartons, and Samuel now wrote to Bancroft that Lee's new secretary had given out for speculating purposes advance information concerning the Franco-American treaty.[22] Lee later was able to secure affidavits from Captain John Paul Jones and Captain M. Livingston to the effect that the information in question was actually transmitted to the Whartons by Bancroft himself, this being their usual channel for such communication. The accusations against Thornton were made in such a way as to implicate Lee, and an unsigned copy of the incriminating information is preserved in the Benjamin Franklin papers. One of the principal objects of these maneuvers was to discredit Lee with Vergennes and the French ministry, and this was effectually accomplished.[23]

Meanwhile the French treaty was signed, and Deane was shortly thereafter recalled by Congress. He departed April 1 for America in

[20] Franklin to Thornton [ ], 1777, Bigelow, *Franklin*, VII. 233–234; Lee, *Arthur Lee*, II. 47–48; *Letters of Richard Henry Lee*, James Curtis Ballagh, ed. (New York, 1914), II. 125–130.

[21] Thornton to the Hon'ble the Commissioners at Paris, Jan. [ ], 1778, Lee MSS., Harvard; *Extracts from a Letter written to the President of Congress by the Honorable Arthur Lee* (Philadelphia, 1780), pp. 14 ff., pamphlet in the Library of Congress.

[22] Thornton to Lee, May [ ], 1778, Lee MSS., Harvard; same to same, May 30, 1778, *ibid.*; statement by Thornton, Apr. 13, 1778, Lee MSS., Univ. of Virginia; Lee, *Arthur Lee*, II. 70–71; *The Deane Papers*, Charles Isham, ed. (New York, 1887), III. 181 ff.

[23] Richard Chapman to Livingston, July 25, 1779, Lee MSS., Harvard; Livingston to John Paul Jones, Mar. 13, 1779, *ibid.*; conversation between [J(oseph) W(harton)] and Dr. R[uston], inclosed by J. W. to Bancroft, Nov. 8, 1777, Stevens, *Facsimiles*, no. 266; J. W[harton] to Bancroft, Nov. 8, 1777, *ibid.*, no. 300; copy of a paper in the hand of Bancroft and delivered by him to Mr. Adams [ ], 1778, Lee MSS., Univ. of Virginia; Livingston to Lee, July 15, 1778, *ibid.*; note by Thornton, May 13, 1778, Franklin MSS., Am. Phil. Soc., XLVII. 112; Lee, *Arthur Lee*, II. 45; Edward S. Corwin, *French Policy and the American Alliance of 1778* (Princeton, 1916), pp. 166–167, n.

company with M. Conrade Gérard, the new French minister to Congress, bearing testimonials of the highest regard from Franklin and Vergennes. Their going was kept secret from Arthur Lee until the last minute. The new charges against Lee were given as the reason for this secrecy, and Gérard presently informed Congress that his government did not trust the Virginian.[24] Just before the departure of these gentlemen, Lee had urged that Deane make up his accounts, but he failed to do so and left his papers behind when he sailed. This did not prevent his presenting Congress with a statement of his claims, his object being to get a settlement without an audit. The statement not only lacked vouchers to support it, but failed to discriminate between public and private charges, and the auditor general reported to this effect. He mentioned also that it would have been helpful if the commissioners had given some account of the cargoes forwarded for public use, with a designation of the persons to whom they had been consigned. He thought it just as important to account for merchandise as for cash.

But Congress never got exact figures on either money or merchandise from Deane.[25] Indeed, his affairs were so involved that not even Franklin pretended to follow them.[26] It is only in the light of secret information gathered by the British government that one can trace the devious operations of this war profiteer.

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY.

The University of Virginia.

PROPAGANDA OR LEGEND

THERE has recently (1932) appeared a book entitled *Liberty: the Story of Cuba,* by Horatio S. Rubens, which contains the following passage (pp. 343–345):

[24] Arthur Lee to Franklin, Apr. 2, 1778, Bigelow, *Franklin,* VII. 277–279; memorial of Arthur Lee to Congress, May 1, 1779, *ibid.,* VIII. 46–57; report of Paca and Drayton to Congress, Apr. 30, 1779, Lee MSS., Harvard.

[25] Report of Committee of Foreign Affairs, Mar. 24, 1779, Papers of the Continental Congress, no. 25, vol. I. ff. 83 ff.; Henry Laurens to R. H. Lee, Aug. 31, 1779, *Deane Papers,* IV. 87–90; V. 300 ff.; report of commissioners, Jan. 5, 1781, Lee MSS., Harvard.

[26] Franklin to Jay, Oct. 4, 1779, Bigelow, *Franklin,* VIII. 129. After having had ample evidence to the contrary, Franklin, in 1779, continued to speak in the highest terms of both Samuel Wharton and Edward Bancroft. Franklin to Hartley, Feb. 22, 1779, Bigelow, VII. 439–440; certificate signed by Franklin, Aug. 8, 1779, Franklin MSS., Am. Phil. Soc., LIV. 55. On May 2, 1784, Franklin wrote to Chaumont: "If we agree and make a settlement so that the state of our accounts may appear clear to my constituents, I shall make no difficulty of advancing the sum you require". Franklin MSS., Am. Phil. Soc., LIV. 125, no. 7.

"We shall see later on that, notwithstanding the Teller resolution, McKinley still harbored the hope of adding Cuba to American territory. For the moment a memorandum, given to General Miles when it appeared that hostilities were proximate, suffices to show the McKinley policy. The memorandum is signed by J. C. Breckenridge, representing the War Department. It permits a better understanding of the subsequent treatment of the Cubans, Puerto Ricans and Filipinos.

"It is headed 'War Department, Office of the Assistant Secretary' and reads":

> This Department, in accord with the State and Navy Departments, deems it necessary to complete instructions which have been given you concerning the military operations of the coming campaign in the Antilles with some observations relative to the political mission which, as commanding General of our forces, will fall upon you.
>
> Annexations of territories to our Republic have been until now of vast regions with sparse population, and always preceded by a pacific invasion of our emigrants so that the absorption and amalgamation of the existing population has been easy and rapid. . . . The Antillean problem is presented under two aspects; one relative to the Island of Cuba and the other to Puerto Rico; and also our aspirations and policy to be observed differ in each case.
>
> As to Puerto Rico, this is an acquisition we must make and preserve, and it will be easy because the change of sovereignty will bring more gain than loss to the interests there, which are more cosmopolitan than Spanish.
>
> For its conquest, relatively easy methods are necessary, emphasizing carefully the fulfillment of all the precepts of the laws among civilized and Christian nations, only in extreme cases bombarding the fortified towns. To avoid conflicts, our forces should be landed on uninhabited places on the south coast. The civil population shall be respected in their persons and property.
>
> I recommend you strongly to especially try, by all possible means, to obtain the good will of the colored race, with two purposes; first to procure their support in a plebiscite for annexation; and second, having in mind that the principal motive and object of the United States in the Antilles is to solve, efficaciously and quickly, our race problems which daily augment, owing to the increase of the negroes who, once they realize the advantages of the West Indies, will flock there.
>
> Cuba, with greater territory, has a greater population than Puerto Rico. Its population consists of whites, negroes, Asiatics and their mixtures. The inhabitants are generally indolent and apathetic. It is obvious that the immediate annexation to our own federation of such elements would be folly, and before so doing, we must clean the country, even though it be by applying the same means which were applied by Divine Providence to Sodom and Gomorrah.
>
> We must destroy everything in range of our guns, we must concentrate blockade so that hunger, and disease its constant companion, may sap the civilians and cut down their army. The allied army should be employed constantly in reconnaissance and rear-guard actions, so that they may suffer rigorously between two fires, and to them shall fall all dangerous and desperate enterprises. . . . We will aid with our arms the independent govern-

ment which will be constituted, although informally, while it is in the minority. Fear, on one hand, and their own interest on the other, will cause this minority to strengthen itself, making the autonomists and Spaniards remaining in the country to appear as the minority.

When this moment arrives, we should create difficulties for the independent Government, and these, and the lack of means to comply with our demands and the obligations created by us, the war expenses and the organization of the new country, will face them. These difficulties should coincide with the troubles and violence among the elements referred to, and to the Opposition we should lend our aid.

Summing up, our policy should always be to support the weaker against the stronger, until we have obtained the extermination of them both, in order to annex the Pearl of the Antilles.

Mr. Rubens does not give his authority for this document's existence. He must have thought it unimpeachable or he would have attempted to verify it. But there is no such document in the War Department, though it has often been looked for. It is uncertain when or why or by whom it was fabricated. It has been traced back as far as 1906; perhaps Mr. Rubens has some clues that would carry it further.

The War Department first heard of the paper in 1908, when the Secretary of State transmitted a clipping from a Santo Domingo newspaper, containing the full text of the alleged memorandum in Spanish—Mr. Rubens gives a slightly abridged English version—and supplying December 24, 1897, as the date. It is known to have been printed five times between 1908 and 1913; *El Eco de Holguín* (Cuba), some time in 1908; *Listín Diario* (Santo Domingo), October 12, 1908; *Reportorio del Diario del Salvador,* June 1, 1911; *El Día de Valparaiso* (Chile), October 11, 1912; *La Independencia* (Santiago de Cuba), some time in 1913. Probably it appeared many times more, for the known instances cover widely separated cities in four countries of Latin America. Each publication furnished the occasion for an editorial bitterly hostile to the United States, containing such charges as the following, from *El Día de Valparaiso:*

"It was written two months before the destruction of the Maine which led to the war with Spain, a circumstance which proves that the disaster was brought about by the Yankees in order to create a motive for beginning hostilities and to set into motion its Machiavellian policy of imperialism."

Certain expressions in Mr. Rubens's version suggest that it is a translation from the Spanish, though of course it does not necessarily follow that it was originally written in that language. As to the authorship of the paper, it appears that the writer—whether English or Spanish speak-

ing—was some one unfamiliar with the War Department. In each available copy the instructions are addressed "al Teniente General J. S. Miles del U. S. A.". *Nelson A.* Miles was a major general at the time in question; "the major general commanding the army" did not receive the rank of lieutenant general until June 6, 1900. The discrepancies can hardly be accounted for by mere carelessness in translating or printing. Again, the signature appears variously as "J. M. Breakreason", "J. M. Breakreazon", and "J. M. Br-ack-ea-on". While this name may seem a rather happy selection it has not much resemblance to that of the assistant secretary, George D. Meiklejohn. He habitually signed his name so clearly that no letter of *Meiklejohn* could be misread, so this is not a case of difficulty in transcribing an illegible signature. Mr. Rubens gives the signature as "J. C. Breckenridge". Perhaps it is his own interpretation or perhaps he derived it from another and earlier version. There actually was a high official of the War Department named J. C. Breck*in*ridge, but the substitution of his name makes the story more improbable instead of less. General Breckinridge was inspector general of the army. How is it conceivable that the inspector general should sign instructions *to* the commanding general or *for* the assistant secretary? It may seem a trifling matter to the layman, but the bureaucratic mind shrinks with horror from the very thought.

I have heard that a book by Enrique Collazo, entitled *La guerra en Cuba* and written in 1903 or 1904, contains something like this memorandum. The Library of Congress has no book of this name by Collazo, but there is one called *Los Americanos en Cuba,* published in Havana in 1905, which treats of the war. Probably this is meant. But neither this nor any other book by Collazo in that library gives anything resembling such a document. In 1906 in Madrid this memorandum was published as an appendix in *Historia de la regencia de María Cristina Hapsbourg-Lorena,* by Juan Ortega Rubio. This is the earliest source known at present.

The evidence at hand, then, indicates no more than that the paper was written at some time not earlier than 1900 and not later than 1906. The reasons for its production can only be surmised.

THOMAS M. SPAULDING.

Washington, D. C.

DOCUMENTS

Fulton and Napoleon in 1800: New Light on the Submarine Nautilus

THE more recent authorities on the life and work of Robert Fulton have been of opinion that in all probability his famous submarine *Nautilus* was first launched and tested at Rouen at the end of July, 1800.[1] The two following letters which, as far as I have been able to discover, have not been previously printed, would appear to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the submarine was first launched and tried out at Paris opposite the Invalides in mid-June, 1800. The view of an earlier writer, G. L. Pesce, who depended on the account of an eyewitness, is thus corroborated.[2] Of the two letters, the one from the minister of marine to the First Consul is, strangely enough, the more important, for it gives a somewhat detailed account of the event and clears up a number of points which have long puzzled the biographers of the great inventor.

The letter from Fulton to Napoleon is important chiefly for itself. In some ways, it is a more interesting letter than the longer letter written by Fulton to Napoleon in September, 1801, and printed *in extenso* by Pesce.[3] The views are the same, but they are expressed in more general terms and with more naïveté. It should not, of course, astonish us that Fulton believed that his new boat would destroy the British fleet, ensure the freedom of the seas, and end naval warfare by making it too terrible to contemplate. Similar views have often been expressed at the introduction of each new weapon more murderous than the last, and Fulton preached them in season and out to the officials and scientists whom the Directory and First Consul appointed to investigate his inventions.[4] There is, however, something inexpressibly naïve in the simple trustful way in which he writes to the greatest conqueror of the age as the apostle

[1] H. W. Dickinson, *Robert Fulton, Engineer and Artist* (London, 1913), p. 100; Wm. Barclay Parsons, *Robert Fulton and the Submarine* (New York, 1922), p. 33. The earlier lives of Fulton by Cadwallader D. Colden (New York, 1817), J. Franklin Reigart (Philadelphia, 1856), and T. W. Knox (New York, 1892) contain very imperfect accounts of Fulton's stay in France and devote little attention to the submarine.

[2] G. L. Pesce, *La navigation sous-marine* (Paris, 1906), p. 196.

[3] Pesce, p. 215. The letter is dated from Brest 19 fructidor, an IX. (Sept. 6, 1801).

[4] See especially opinions quoted in Dickinson, pp. 79, 89, 92, 99; and in Alice Crary Sutcliffe, *Robert Fulton and the Clermont* (New York, 1909), p. 100.

of universal peace. The letter is also noteworthy because of the stress that it lays on the matter of belligerent rights for the submarine. Fulton's anxiety not to be treated as a pirate and outlaw was the cause of much friction between him and the French authorities. This letter therefore helps to strengthen the view of a recent writer that Fulton's insistence on "protection" is the crucial point on which the negotiations between them broke down.[5]

The confusion of Fulton's biographers with regard to the building and launching of the *Nautilus* arose quite naturally from the evidence that was before them. There were a number of good reasons for doubting the account of Guyton de Morveau,[6] one of the well-known chemists of the day, who had stated in an article in the *Bulletin de la société d'encouragement pour l'industrie nationale* in July, 1809, that he had been an eyewitness in June, 1800, of the first trials of the *Nautilus* "sur la Seine en face des Invalides".[7] In the first place, Maurice Delpeuch, who had been among the first to examine the archival material on Fulton's sojourn in France, brought to the attention of the world by Émile Duboc in 1896, had stated in his book on submarines: "Quoi qu'il en soit, Fulton fut autorisé à construire un sousmarin à Rouen."[8] Moreover, since there seemed to be no documentary evidence for the launching and trials at Paris in June, 1800, it appeared quite possible that Guyton de Morveau might have been confusing the trials of the submarine in 1800 with the similar trials of Fulton's steamboat on the Seine in 1803. The chief difficulty lay in the fact that the official documents available led rather inescapably to the conclusion that the *Nautilus* was launched at Rouen, 5 thermidor, an VIII. (July 24, 1800). A letter from Quesnel, commissaire de la marine at Rouen, to the minister at Paris, dated 29 messidor, an VIII. (July 18, 1800), was responsible for leading investigators astray. Quesnel reported the addition of a modification to the *Nautilus* which he described as "à peu près fini".[9] This did not trouble Pesce, who had accepted Guyton de Morveau's story, for he

[5] See Henry Harrison Suplee, Fulton in France, *Cassier's Magazine*, XXXII. (Sept., 1907) 410; Maurice Delpeuch, *La navigation sous-marine à travers les siècles* (Paris, 1902), pp. 82 ff. On 12 frimaire, an IX. (Dec. 3, 1800), Fulton wrote, in a letter to the minister of marine, "There will be little merit in the government in adopting this project if it demands that an individual at his own expense without protection, and without any other encouragement than that it accords to ordinary sailors, should succeed in destroying an English vessel". Dickinson, p. 112.

[6] Louis Bernard, Baron Guyton de Morveau (1737–1816), an associate of Lavoisier in chemical researches, author of many treatises on scientific subjects. See article in *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., XII. 747.

[7] Pesce, p. 196. [8] Delpeuch, p. 109. [9] Dickinson, p. 101; Pesce, p. 197.

quite correctly surmised that the submarine, having already been tried out at Paris, was laid up at Rouen for repairs preparatory to further trials.[10] Nevertheless, it was impossible for H. W. Dickinson, who reviewed the whole matter in preparing his biography of Fulton in 1913, to accept this view unreservedly.

Dickinson's work deserves careful attention on this question as the most recent thorough study of Fulton's life. He attempted to piece together every scrap of evidence with regard to Fulton's struggles to interest the Directors and First Consul in his projects during the years 1797–1804. Dickinson seems to have been led to doubt Pesce, not only because Pesce was inaccurate in other matters,[11] but because the material published from Fulton's own papers by Alice Crary Sutcliffe did not tend to support Guyton de Morveau's story of the launching of the *Nautilus*.[12] Dickinson therefore was forced to sum up the matter as follows:

> On the authority of an eye-witness, the trial trip is stated to have taken place on the Seine in front of the Hôtel des Invalides, but it is possible that his memory was at fault and that he was confusing those trials with those of the steamboat of 1803 because the official documents suggest that the submarine was built at Rouen, a much more suitable place.[13]

Consequently this was the view accepted in 1922 by W. B. Parsons in his *Robert Fulton and the Submarine*, a work chiefly concerned with new materials on the submarine and torpedo projects which Fulton laid before the British government after his return to England in 1804. Parsons states definitely that the *Nautilus* was built and launched at Rouen, and makes much of the famous interview between Fulton and Napoleon in the late autumn of 1800 when Napoleon may have lost a golden opportunity to change the face of the world.[14]

Harvard University. HOLDEN FURBER.

I.

Paris, le 27 prairial, an 8me [June 16, 1800]
de la Republique une et indivisible

Le Ministre de la Marine et des Colonies
Au premier Consul Bonaparte [copy] [15]

[10] Pesce, pp. 195 ff. [11] Notably in thinking that there was a *Nautilus II*.

[12] Sutcliffe, p. 79. This author, a great-granddaughter of the inventor, simply says, "The vessel was built during the latter part of 1800, and throughout the succeeding summer Fulton was at Brest". [13] Dickinson, p. 100. [14] Parsons, pp. 35–38.

[15] The letter appears to be the clerk's usual rough copy retained in the office for reference, Archives nationales, A. F. IV., carton 1187.

Citoyen Consul

J'assistai le 24 a une experience du *Nautulus*[16] de fulton, laquelle s'est faite dans la Seine vis-a-vis la pompe-a-feu des frères Periers[17]—tout ce qu'on pouvait desirer de cette experience a été complettement obtenu. Le bateau plonge et se demerge avec beaucoup de facilité. Les hommes qui le manoeuvre sont restés 45 minutes sans renouveler l'air dans l'interieur du Bateau, et quand ils sont sortis il ne paraissait sur le visage aucune alteration.

Le C^en^ Guiton Morveau present à cette experience a dit, qu'en mettant en approvisionnement quelques jarres de gaz oxigêne, et faisant éteindre un peu de chaux pour neutraliser l'azor, on prolongerait de double et même du triple le temps pendant lequel l'air continu dans le bateau suffrirait à la combustion d'une lampe et la vie de 3 hommes sans affecter leurs poumons d'une manière nuisible.

Il n'y avait pas assez d'Eau, et le courant etait trop rapide pour qu'on pût faire l'essai des moyens de direction sous l'Eau: ce n'est qu'a Rouen qu'on pourra y proceder parce qu'on y trouve plus de 30 pieds de profondeur et deux fois par jour la cessation des courants causée par le flux et le reflux. On pourra proceder a cette essai sous 15 jours.

Le Bateau Nautulus navigue fort bien a la voile. Il y a quelques changements[18] a faire a sa voilure que l'on a d'abord etabli sur de trop petites dimensions; il est demontrer que quand elle sera mieux proportionnée a la masse on pourra naviguer avec securité et faire par un bon temps au moins deux lieues à l'heure, même sur le perpendiculaire du vent.

Voilà, mon General, ou en est cette affaire; elle commence a faire naître quelques esperances, et dans un mois, le Nautulus peut être en mer et agir.

Vous savez que le Gouvernement n'a rien encore payé pour cette experience, qui coûte 28,000 f a son auteur. Il demande qu'on lui donne 6,000 f a titre de pret. Cela ne peut concilier avec les regles et la comptabilité; mais, si vous le jugiez a propos, on trouverait bien le moyen de venir au secours de l'operation.

Une autre demande que fait l'auteur est contenue dans la lettre ci-incluse; je ne crois pas que vous y repondiez favorablement; mais dans le cas ou vous penseriez que le nouveau genre de guerre Maritime qu'il propose, pût produire un effet utile a la marine française, et peut être a l'humanité entiere, vous trouveriez bien d'autres moyens de stimuler son zèle.

En attendant vos ordres sur ces objets, je vais faire descendre le Nautulus a Rouen, et je regarde ces experiences comme tellement importantes, ne fut-ce que pour le progrès des arts, que je demanderai aux Consuls leur agrément pour aller incognito en voir quelques unes quand il s'en fera de décisives.

Salut et Respect,

[signed] FORFAIT[19]

[16] This spelling was one frequently used by Fulton in the earlier stages of his negotiations with the French government.

[17] The boat had been built at the workshops of the Perrier brothers, see Pesce, p. 195.

[18] *I. e.*, those later referred to in the letter of Quesnel of 29 messidor, an VIII.

[19] P. A. L. Forfait (1752–1807), naval architect, educated under D'Estaing; minister of marine, Nov. 24, 1799—Oct. 1, 1801; subsequently councilor of state, inspector general of the flotilla of Boulogne, commander of the Legion of Honor, maritime prefect of Havre, and of Genoa. See Dickinson, p. 81, n. 5.

II.

Paris, 26 Prairial, An 8me [June 15, 1800]
Robert Fulton au Premier Consul [copy] [20]

Citoyen Consul

J'ai fait aujourd'hui [21] mon experience de navigation submarine en presence des ministres de la marine et de la guerre et j'espère qu'ils vous en donneront leur opinion, d'après ma connoissance des machines que j'y emploie, je suis persuadé qu'avec la patience et le soin qu'on doit a un objet si majeur qu'on viendra à bout d'anneantir l'enorme puissance maritime de l'Angleterre et d'etablir la liberté des mers; sous votre protection je ferai mon possible de perfectioner l'invention et de la rendre efficace. — Mais comme les Anglais pourroient considerer cette entreprise comme incendiary, et en cas que je tomberai en leur pouvoir, on me peut traiter, moi et mes compagnons, autrement que comme prisonniers de guerre, j'espère citoyen consul que dans une entreprise si importante pour la france et la cause de la liberté, vous ne refuserez pas de m'accorder tout la protection que votre nom et charactere pouvent me donner, en me fournissant d'une lettre signée de votre main declarant au Gouvernement de l'Angleterre et a ses officiers que vous protegerez cette entreprise avec tout votre pouvoir. — Permettez-moi donc, C^n Consul de vous proposer la forme d'une lettre qui me parait necessaire a ma protection.

Bonaparte, Premier Consul de la Republique françoise
A S.M. le Roi d'Angleterre et aux officiers de sa marine:

Le Citoyen Robert Fulton, Auteur d'une methode de navigation submarine pour la destruction des marines militaires et l'assurance de la liberté de commerce de toutes les nations; ayant demander ma protection pour l'execution de son entreprise et vu les immenses Advantages qui puissent en resulter dans les affaires de l'Europe, les causes de presque touts les guerres detruites et la bonne intelligence rendu aux nations, je lui accord cette protection, et je vous declare qu'en cas que le dit Fulton ou ses compagnons tombeat entre vos mains et ne sont pas traités comme prisonniers de guerre, j'userai de droit de talion sur les officiers et matelots Anglais que la fortune de la guerre peut placer a ma disposition. — Et comme je regarde la machine dont il se sert comme instrument de liberté et d'humanité,[22] je declare que je ne soufferai

[20] Arch. Nat., A. F. IV., carton 1187.

[21] This slight discrepancy in the date is a matter of some difficulty. It would appear either that it is due to a clerical error or that Fulton had difficulties with the French Revolutionary calendar as well as with the French language. It may be noted that Pesce corrected the mistakes in grammar and orthography in Fulton's letter to Napoleon of 19 fructidor, an IX., before allowing it to appear in print.

[22] *Cf.* the following excerpt from Fulton's letter to Barras of 6 brumaire, an VII. (Oct. 27, 1798): "Si, au premier coup d'oeil, les moyens que je propose paraissent revoltons, ce n'est que parce qu'ils sont extraordinaires, ils ne sont rien moins qu'inhumains, certainement c'est la manière la plus douce et la moins sanguinaire que le philosophe puisse imaginer pour renverser ce système de brigandage et de guerre perpetuelle qui a toujours vexé les nations maritimes;—pour donner enfin la paix à la terre et pour rendre les hommes à leur industrie naturelle, et à un bonheur jusqu'ici inconnu." Dickinson, p. 89.

pas qu'on l'en serve pour l'oppression des peuples Anglois mais pour la protection du Commerce et de l'industrie qui constituent l'interée de toutes les nations et doivent être l'objet de tout gouvernement.— [23]

Citoyen consul — une declaration a cet effet inspirera une grande confiance dans mes compagnons et peut determiner nos operations.

Salut et Respect —

[23] This is obviously the letter to which Fulton referred when he wrote Forfait from Rouen, 11 thermidor, an VIII. [July 30, 1800], "I have not yet heared[*sic*] any thing of the letter of protection from the Primier[*sic*] Consul . . . . ". Dickinson, p. 102.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF GENERAL HISTORY

A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools. By CHARLES A. BEARD. [American Historical Association, Report of the Commission on Social Studies, Part I.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. Pp. xii, 122. $1.25.)

THIS is the first of a series of twelve volumes containing the report of the Commission on the Social Studies, which during the last five years has been working under the auspices of the American Historical Association. For the first time such a commission has been adequately financed. The notable personnel of the commission guarantees a stimulating, comprehensive treatment of a very baffling field of school work. Other volumes in the series may not follow the example set by Mr. Beard, but this one is certainly in great contrast to previous reports in this field, not only in its keen penetrative philosophy but also in its delightful style.

There is little that is hackneyed in the volume. There is of course the old emphasis on "the truth" and the scholarly approach as the basis for all work in the social sciences. On the other hand the title and the subject matter almost altogether avoid the use of the word "objectives". Instead we have twenty-three pages of "The Supreme Purpose" in civic instruction, which is "the creation of rich and many-sided personalities". When broken down into its component parts, this ideal emphasizes the ability of an individual to acquire and understand information in the social world, to analyze and synthesize it scientifically, to form habits and attitudes as a result of the pursuit and use of knowledge in this field, and to develop loyalty, will power and courage, imagination and æsthetic appreciation in civic affairs.

Most of the remaining part of the volume is devoted to what the author calls "social realities of our times" including ideas. The aim of civic instruction in the United States is to strengthen democratic government. The test of social science instruction therefore is the extent to which individuals, social institutions, human relations, and even material conditions of life are thereby improved and developed.

Those who are shocked at improving material conditions of life through civic instruction are reminded that the Constitution itself was set up in order to promote the general welfare. Specifically such an ideal includes, for example, not merely personal hygiene, but safety in mines, pure milk safeguards, and housing regulations. Indeed on the basis of this broad charter the author attempts a summary of "some of the goals which the American

nation seems to have set for itself—goals which must of necessity shape instruction in the social studies". These include national planning in industry and business, perfection of transportation facilities, and the extension of preventive medicine.

The author then dips generously into the realm of "American ideals" in which he includes health, useful work for all, leisure, educational opportunities, no special privileges, recognition on the basis of achievement, the elimination of poverty, coöperative planning, and individual liberty, all based on the philosophy of continuing social progress and development. These ideals are just as much a part of the realities of social life as other factual information. Indeed, instruction in the social studies may well seek as a climax the æsthetic development of the individual, which more often is expressed by great poets and literary men than by those who write our texts in history and civics.

The question should be raised as to whether the author has not attempted to indulge in a process of indoctrination. How can such a process be avoided? The selection of materials of instruction by textbook writers or teachers from among the great mass of possibilities, so the author holds, almost certainly indicates a certain philosophy as to what subjects and problems are significant in American life. It is a short step to what may be considered by the writer or the teacher as a national goal or an "American ideal".

The inevitableness and especially the necessity for a platform of goals and ideals has been overemphasized. A social good or an ideal has little meaning to an individual except through the process of personal analysis and evaluation. As this process goes on the relative importance of and even the characteristics of these goals and ideals, as the author clearly points out elsewhere, change materially. Hence what some one may believe has become a national goal at a given time is not so important as building up in the individual student the habit of constructive criticism, analysis and synthesis of each social phenomenon as it appears. If the process has been carried on adequately a social program suited to the needs of the time will result. Men and nations differ among themselves on goals and ideals in a democratic society. It is all the more important, therefore, that the processes of perpetuating democratic society, which changes and modifies its goals and ideals, should not be subordinated to the realities of social life at any particular period of development. The author appreciates the value of the educational process in the development of personal and national goals but he has given it less attention than it deserves.

On the other hand, there is a wholesome warning that one should not expect too much of the schools by way of preparation for civic responsibilities. Children cannot grasp adequately many situations facing adults, nor can any prophet foretell what social problems will face men and women twenty to fifty years out of school. The need for adult education is recognized repeatedly.

The third and final situation conditioning the teaching of the social studies, according to the author, is "the requirements of the teaching and learning process". Only three pages are devoted to the subject. Its treatment is not at all adequate.

Mr. Beard has given us a very stimulating treatment of a subject which up to this time has usually been set forth in an uninteresting manner. Here we have at last a philosophy of the subject which, whether one agrees with it in detail or not, is of inestimable value in helping us to determine what we expect to get out of the teaching of the social studies in the schools.

Washington. GEORGE F. ZOOK.

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Dawn of Conscience. By JAMES HENRY BREASTED. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933. Pp. xxvi, 431. $3.00.)

THIS latest work of our foremost American Egyptologist is in my opinion a great book. For more than a quarter of a century he has been one of the ablest interpreters of the records and history of the ancient Egyptians. And now Dr. Breasted takes us once more, and in a delightful fashion, through the literature which deals with the development of their moral and social conscience. It is the same course which he traversed in his *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt* (1912), but the story is interestingly retold and many new links in the development, made possible by the recovery of coffin-texts and the teachings of Amenemope and other newly discovered literature, are supplied. The book from the point of view of Egyptology is an outstanding contribution, but it is much more than that. It is an attempt to trace the evidence of the development of the human conscience from the dawn of history to the beginnings of Christianity.

Professor Breasted's thesis is that in Egypt the conscience of man, and especially the social conscience, developed more fully and at an earlier period than elsewhere, and that Egypt became in this respect a teacher of the other nations of the Near East. Secluded by her deserts, secure in her isolation on the Nile, untroubled by attacks from outside, Egypt through a long period of peace developed a stable government which made reflection upon the origin and destiny of man and the place of ethics in his history possible as nowhere else. There is indeed much truth in this thesis, though at times the author seems unaware of evidence of any development outside of Egypt.

The book is, however, even more than a contribution to Egyptology and to the history of ethics. In his epilogue, Professor Breasted has connected his history of the development of conscience in man with anthropology and the evolution of the universe. He has shown that the development of the conscience in the homo sapiens, who is a part of the evolutionary process of the universe, answers in the affirmative Haeckel's famous question, "Is the uni-

verse friendly?" Professor Breasted's able treatment of this part of his theme makes his book an important contribution to our understanding of the nature of the universe.

Some of the author's paragraphs make it evident that his scientific researches have carried him far, in some respects, from the faith in which he was reared, but the reviewer ventures to think that, far as it may have been from Professor Breasted's intention to do so, he has in the present work laid the foundation for a new and better theology. In other words, in the judgment of the reviewer he has not only made a contribution to Egyptology, to the history of ethics, and to the science of the universe, but written prolegomena of a new theology.

Horace remarks somewhere in his *De arte poetica* that "at times even the good Homer nods", and Professor Breasted's fine volume has in the judgment of the reviewer some minor defects. It seems, for example, inconsistent to assert that because of Egypt's isolation and consequent peaceful history her social conscience was developed and then to point out on subsequent pages that the literature giving the evidence of this originated in a time of great internecine strife. From the point of view of psychology it is in times of stress that the social consciousness comes to its fruition.

At times, too, the author's vision seems too closely confined to Egypt whose history he knows so well, for he overlooks the fact that the social consciousness reflected in the literature of the 9th and 10th dynasties between 2400 and 2100 B. C. had found similar expression in the acts and chronicles of a Babylonian ruler, Urukahina of Lagash, as early as 2700 B. C. (see the reviewer's *Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad,* New Haven, 1929, pp. 79 ff.). Further, the author cites the fact that in the Babylonian and Hittite codes of laws slaves are not accorded the full privileges and responsibilities of free citizens, and contrasts this with the ideal utterances of Egypt's wise men as to the rights of the common man. His inference is that Egypt was much more socially minded than Babylon or Hittite City. Is the argument quite fair? Breasted himself has pointed out that the papyrus Harris shows that in the twelfth century B. C. one and one-half per cent of the population of Egypt were slaves of the temples. At the same time, he has shown that the king possessed even a larger number of slaves (see his *History of Egypt,* pp. 308–309, 496–497; and *Ancient Records, Egypt,* IV. 103). If to these we could add the slaves possessed by Egyptian nobles, doubtless the society of Egypt would be, in this respect, indistinguishable from that of Babylonia or the Hittite country. If we had Egypt's law codes, instead of the musings of her idealists, it is doubtful if anyone would suspect that her conscience differed from that of other countries. Egypt in the mind of our author has gained an advantage, which the reviewer cannot but consider in part fictitious, from the (to her) fortunate fact that her laws have not survived! Such minor defects are apt to creep into the work of all specialists

when they lift their vision from their own field to embrace a larger horizon. One is reminded of Browning's *Grammarian:*

> "This high man, aiming at a million,
> Misses an unit".

There can be no doubt that the literature of ancient Egypt contains evidence of moral reflection in a far larger degree than the literature of any other ancient people, except the Chinese whom she antedated by 2000 years, and it is also doubtless true that the interest of the Egyptians in life after death quickened their interest in the value of conduct. Broadly speaking, the place which Professor Breasted assigns to Egypt in the development of the human conscience is deserved, even if his enthusiasm has led him here and there to overemphasize it.

The University of Pennsylvania. GEORGE A. BARTON.

Calendar of Ormond Deeds, 1172–1350. Edited by EDMUND CURTIS, Litt.D., Professor of Modern History, Trinity College, Dublin.

The Red Book of Ormond. Edited by NEWPORT B. WHITE, M.A., Marsh's Librarian, Dublin. [Ormond Deeds, the Mediæval Documents preserved at Kilkenny Castle, published by the Irish Manuscripts Commission.] (Dublin: The Stationery Office. 1932. Pp. lxii, 424; xii, 184. 10*s.*; 5*s.*)

THESE volumes are of great importance for the medieval history of Ireland, especially for the conditions arising from the contact of Irish and English there. They will hold somewhat the same position in the history of Ireland that the Denbigh Survey holds in the history of Wales, although less full and complete than that incomparable document. They form part of a series of Ormond deeds to be completed by the Irish Manuscripts Commission, and show the able editing one would expect. There are many identifications of difficult place-names and much care is spent in determining dates. The *Calendar,* the larger volume, contains summaries of records covering the period from the reign of Henry II. to that of Edward III., and is mainly concerned with lands in the counties of Kilkenny and Tipperary. They are derived from the great collection which is preserved in the muniment room of Kilkenny Castle, and which is, "since the destruction of the Public Record Office, Dublin, in 1922, the largest single collection of mediæval deeds and records now extant in Ireland". The editor justly and enthusiastically claims that from them an "enormous addition" may be made to our knowledge of Irish conditions. They throw light on social and economic matters, on the relations of the crown with Irish barons and chiefs, on the functioning of the central courts, and on many matters genealogical, linguistic, and topographical. The documents of the later period, following on those calendared here,

have been already reported on in a number of volumes of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of Great Britain. A beginning of calendaring the medieval manuscripts also was made by the same commission before the war, but was discontinued, and the results of the earlier work have been included in the present volume.

The editor, after a very short preface, lists and dates the 863 documents, and then proceeds with the calendar of their contents. They are largely grants and quit claims, bonds, indentures, and extents. The grants of land of Donald, king of Limerick, are of interest, with bounds made "as he perambulated and rode over the mountains and hills". There are also grants of Strongbow, and of William Marshal; and grants of "entertainments" by John, lord of Ireland. The charters are indispensable for the study of many individuals and families famous in English and Irish history. A foundation charter of Kells is given, and an agreement between Ormond and O'Kennedy which shows survivals of the old blood feud arrangements. Sanctuaries appear and "crosslands"; papal grants, and interesting limitations on the Irish Franciscans. An introduction concerned with some at least of the many questions raised by the *Calendar* would, in the judgment of the reviewer, have been a great addition to the work. The terms used often require some comment, and while many of them are explained in the editor's other works, or are fairly well known—like betaghs, tuaths, cantreds, bohers—yet we should be grateful for the editor's interpretations of them as used here, and for some discussion of the nature of the tenements and measures of land. The stang has received attention from Mr. G. J. Turner and others. The 'sovereign of Kilkenny' and the 'Irish town' invite further study, and so does the interesting system whereby fines can be cut to sixpence—a custom which held in parts of England also. A delightful conveyance of seisin over lands, pastures, farm animals, sheep, and 'mousers and mice' may be noticed. As would be expected, we hear much of common pasture, turbary, and estovers.

The *Red Book* is not a calendar, but a transcript of a cartulary and extent of the Ormond lands dating in the main from the fourteenth century. The history of the manuscript is given in the short introduction. Burned in a fire in the castle in 1839, parts, recovered by the Reverend James Graves, were put together with great skill under the direction of Sir Frederick Madden, at the British Museum. The present edition is from this manuscript, collated with a transcript now in the Bodleian. The extents and rentals give a good deal of information on the subject of knights' fees, royal service, free tenants, gavellers, betaghs, and cottars. A study of the names of the holders of lands shows the position of the Irish, occurring most often in the class of *betagii;* and the rents and *opera* of this class throw light on the position of the Irish serf. The conventional forms of expression and preponderance of information about the English tenants are perhaps a little disappointing, and here too, one would have been grateful for more discussion by the editor than is afforded

in the very brief notes on the contents and vocabulary. Both books have good indexes.

Mt. Holyoke College. N. Neilson.

Le premier budget de la monarchie française: Le compte général de 1202–1203. Par Ferdinand Lot et Robert Fawtier. [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études.] (Paris: Honoré Champion. 1932. Pp. 302 and 72 facsimiles. 75 fr.)

The general account of the receipts and expenditures of the king of France for the financial year 1202–1203 is the oldest known record of its kind. Since the disappearance of the original, probably in 1737, it has been available only as edited by Brussel in 1725 in the second volume (pp. 139–210) of his *Nouvel examen de l'usage général des fiefs.* Léopold Delisle called this edition defective and Borelli de Serres thought it incomplete. Certainly no one has ever used this document with a thorough grasp of its meaning, despite its obvious importance for the administrative history of France in the early thirteenth century. Professor Lot has now reproduced Brussel's edition photographically. More important, he has analyzed and elucidated its contents and has induced Professor Fawtier to provide extensive appendixes, a glossary, and an indispensable index. A few unsolved and doubtless insoluble problems still remain, but Professor Lot and his associate have turned a veritable flood of light upon much that has long remained dark and mysterious. Borelli de Serres's dictum that this record is the foundation of all study of the financial administration of France in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries must now be amended. Professor Lot's essay with its accompanying critical apparatus will henceforth constitute the point of departure for all students.

Professor Lot characterizes the 1202–1203 account as a *livre de caisse,* almost a 'budget' in the original meaning of that term, and not at all as one of the *Magna recepta, Magna expensa* series of records of which we have several examples for later years. He thinks it was drawn up at the Temple and that it demonstrates clearly the direct relationship of *prévôts* and Temple, Borelli de Serres to the contrary notwithstanding. Moreover, he considers Brussel's edition to have been both complete and careful.

By an ingenious and intricate argument, buttressed with numerous tabular computations, Professor Lot establishes convincingly the totals of receipts and expenditures as listed in the document, with due allowance for sums appearing twice and similar complications. His conclusion is that Philip Augustus had a surplus of one hundred thousand pounds, money of Paris, in 1202–1203 and probably had one of sixty thousand in a normal year. The actual net surplus of the crown remains uncertain, however, since all Professor Lot's learning does not really suffice to discover the probable expenses of the

hôtel du roi in 1202–1203, clearly a factor in the problem. An attempt is also made to compare the Plantagenet with the Capetian revenue in 1202–1203, thus indicating some of the possibilities of this record for the political history of France under Philip Augustus. Such comparisons are always perilous and Professor Lot has probably not succeeded in avoiding all the pitfalls inherent in such a task. He concludes, however, that the Plantagenet revenue from Continental lands, ordinarily equal to that derived from England, amounted to little or nothing in 1202–1203, and that the Plantagenet revenue from England in that year was less than that derived from the royal domain by Philip Augustus. Thus it would appear certain, as much other evidence strongly implies, that the event of 1204 turned to a very considerable degree upon financial factors.

Smith College. SIDNEY R. PACKARD.

The Baronial Plan of Reform, 1258–1263. By R. F. TREHARNE, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of History in the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. [University of Manchester, Historical Series, No. LXII.] (Manchester: University Press. 1932. Pp. xv, 448. 17*s.* 6*d.*)

THIS informing volume is a study in constitutional history from the viewpoint of administration, an additional piece of evidence of the profound influence of the late Professor Tout on historical research, though much is owed also in this instance to Professors Jacob and Powicke. The main theme is the reforms of 1258 and, as a proper introduction, the author gives a comprehensive survey, based on recent books and articles, of the development of local and central administration during the century prior to 1258. A specialized judicial and administrative group had been formed which was increasingly professional; it represented the steadily advancing royal power. This made the monarchy more efficient, but at the same time less responsive to control; as George Burton Adams used to say (speaking, however, of the period before 1216), it became more of a "constitutional absolutism".

With this background we approach the principal subject. Here the author has made skillful use of the great accumulation of new materials from record sources, the various plea, chancery, and pipe rolls. He sets forth in great detail and with vividness the changes wrought by the reformers. He shows how the reform movement took its inception and once started gradually unfolded during the months succeeding Henry III.'s "mad" Parliament, involving changes which embraced central and local administration; how for a little while the baronial party commanded universal support and organized far-reaching reforms; how the tide turned and the power of the reformers began to decline before the opposition of pope and king, and was finally destroyed by the schism within the ranks of the barons themselves; in this fall the fierce, intractable character of Simon played a noteworthy part. The aim

of the reformers, the author feels, was to place the administration permanently in the hands of the barons, as the only conceivable class that would be capable of directing it.

One or two matters of interpretation merit some further comment. The aims of the reformers are pictured in the most favorable light. For example: "The noblest idealism and the loftiest hopes accompanied its inception [*i.e.*, of the reforming movement], for the entire baronage combined to redress all the wrongs of the nation". "These reforms, though initiated by an aristocratic government, were conceived in a spirit of genuine altruism, were framed by the help of the bureaucracy, and were applied with the indispensable cooperation of that large class of county gentlemen which the baronage summoned into political and constitutional importance from the vague fringes of the administration and the unprofessional service of the local courts". "The baronage rose to heights of idealism never attained by their class at any later time." The author's discussion of the reforms of the shrievalty—so important an office in the administrative system—may serve to illustrate this interpretation. The strict rules laid down for the sheriffs' guidance, the limitation of their terms to a single year, the new method of election, *viz.*, by the election of four knights in the county court who then in the presence of the exchequer officials designated the sheriff, and finally the committee of knights of the shire who were to watch the sheriff's acts and report on them—this whole organization means, for Professor Treharne, the rise of the county gentlemen into new political and constitutional importance.

Yet this interpretation is not wholly convincing. It should be remembered that while the barons had in 1258 seized upon the central organization including the exchequer, they were also under all circumstances the controlling force in every county court. Shall we be sure then that this new procedure means that the rear vassals were to exercise any greater power than earlier under Henry III. and John when they were ever more frequently chosen to coöperate in various executive and judicial acts? The recent volume by Professor White (*Self-Government at the King's Command*), ending with the minority of Henry III., demonstrates the remarkable use that the Angevins constantly made of the people in administration. So common indeed was the practice that tenants were continually purchasing exemption from the obligation to serve on assizes and juries, from acting as sheriffs, as coroners, and the like. The sheriffs selected by the barons in 1258 and 1259 do not represent a personnel hitherto excluded from the administration, for some had held the office earlier and others had been previously exempted by royal grant. The whole practice had always meant the extension and not the limitation of the power of the central government. It would seem therefore that the baronial group by the advice of the permanent officials devised this new local organization as the means by which they could control more effectively the county administra-

tion in addition to the central government (an extension vital to their success) and that in so doing they followed a well-established tradition.

The Petition of the Barons and the resultant Provisions of Westminster contain various articles to the advantage of rear vassals. Why were they introduced? "The Provisions", says the author, "represent a genuine effort at reform in the interests of all freemen". "It says much for the baronial reformers in the council and for the baronage as a whole that in spite of strong opposition these reforms were passsed by the very class that would be most hampered by them, at a time when that class completely dominated the political situation. The baronial council was not moved by selfish class interests in this matter". It may be so. But we should also call attention to the fact that the barons were following consistent royal precedent in these articles. In the charter of Henry I. and in Magna Carta, the king declared that his barons must observe the feudal rules toward their men. Let us remember, moreover, that the feudal system in England was no pyramid; that tenants in chief were also rear vassals; that these conditions of transposition were fostered by the constant and increasing custom of alienating land. Thus any regulation that protected the rights of rear vassals in 1258 could not fail to protect the rights of those who were also tenants in chief. Had the barons therefore in the Provisions of Westminster any aim other than their own interests? At least, we must call attention to the fact that their design in these respects may have been thoroughly "practical" rather than idealistic.

No one has gone deeper into the history of the period than Professor Treharne. He has in every way added to our knowledge; and his spirit, his enthusiasm, and constant suggestive interpretation can only stimulate new interest in this important field.

Yale University. SYDNEY K. MITCHELL.

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Bibliography of British History: Tudor Period, 1485–1603. Edited by CONYERS READ. [Issued under the Direction of the American Historical Association and the Royal Historical Society of Great Britain.] Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. xxiii, 467. $8.50.)

THERE is no doubt at all that this is an extremely useful work. The editor is already preëminent among historians as the author of *Mr. Secretary Walsingham,* but it is doubtful whether even that monumental work will be more prized by students of Tudor history than this bibliography. It is necessary to insist upon its merits, for it is almost inevitable that a review should partake of the nature of a criticism. The main difficulties that beset the bibliographer are three—the gathering and selecting of material, its organization, and its

accurate presentation. It is convenient to follow here this threefold division.

Whoever is dissatisfied with the amount of material listed in this work is hard to please. Indeed, he is more likely to complain that a sharp ax has not been brought to bear upon dead wood, than that any fertile land has been neglected. This criticism is especially true of chapters XI. and XII. Both "Local History" and "Scotland" contain a number of works which might well be left forgotten or which have no special significance for the 16th century. Perhaps the one legitimate complaint that might be raised against any section on the ground of inadequacy should be levied against chapter X., and particularly against section 2. It is doubtful whether the ordinary student will be able to derive much profit from this very miscellaneous group of titles, which, in addition to being incomplete, seems ill-arranged. Perhaps the worst errors are the omissions of Clark S. Northup's *Register of Bibliographies of the English Language and Literature* and of Arthur G. Kennedy's *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language;* and to leave out Jusserand's *Literary History* is almost as bad, because it is strong in historical and cultural elements. It seems strange to include a work of which it is said that it "treats the folk aspect of Elizabethan drama", and to omit the lives of Shakespeare by Sidney Lee and J. Q. Adams. It seems characteristic of the general outlook on literature that the only place that could be found for *Shakespeare's England* is under "Economics". The annual bibliography of English Renaissance literature in *Studies in Philology* is edited by Hardin Craig alone.

It is probable that no two people would ever agree on the details of the arrangement of so many titles as are supplied; and to the usual difficulties of arrangement are added, in this case, the disposal of many titles which belong more properly to a general volume, such as was once contemplated by the Association and Society responsible for this volume, than to a volume confined to a single period. The sectional arrangement, especially when it takes the form of segregating all the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, is not likely to please all readers, who might perhaps ask that, for the sake of consistency, the calendars of documents preserved in the Public Record Office should also be kept together.

The usual way in which a title is listed here is to begin with the author's name, then the title follows, and last comes the editor's name, introduced with the word "By" (not with "Ed. by"). The result is that *Shakespeare's England* is attributed to C. T. Onions, although his name does not appear in any capacity on the title-page (date of publication should be 1916, not 1917). Sometimes a composite work is said to be by its printer or publisher (*e.g.,* No. 1671). This system has other inconveniences, for an entry of the following type certainly has an odd look: "562a BOUILLON ET DE SANCY EN ANGLETERRE en 1596 . . . Négociations de MM. de. By [G. H.] Gaillard". The items are arranged in the alphabetical order of their authors' names, or

of their titles when there are no authors' names. As the names are listed in the index, this procedure seems to do the same thing twice over.

The number of errors that have been detected is not large in proportion to the number of facts supplied. The section on "Chronicles" perhaps is a fair sample. In addition to the unfortunate note about the "great chronicle" (No. 284) and slips about the early editions of Hall's "Union of the two noble and illustre famelies York and Lancaster" [*sic*], No. 285 has no title and No. 286 has only an abbreviated title, with the order of the words changed. Under "Local History", perhaps Gloucestershire should not be regarded as typical, for Hyett and Austin produced their biographical *Supplement* in two volumes; while Norris Mathews's *Bristol Bibliography* and St. Clair Baddeley's *History of Cirencester* should have been mentioned, and, possibly, *Bristol Lists* by A. B. Beaven (whose name does not appear in the index).

A certain lack of uniformity is inevitable. Perhaps one of the most serious examples of varying usage is provided by the practice of some compilers in using the exact title, and in trying to preserve its archaic spelling, etc., and to indicate omissions, whereas others modernize spelling and do not indicate omissions. The latter are the more commendable, for the former make mistakes in almost every entry. A comparison with the originals of six of the entries on two pages (pp. 154–155) of one of the best sections revealed trivial slips in five of the titles—usually about one in every line. Incidentally, it is rather a waste of space to list No. 1669, for it is reprinted in *A Parte of a Register*. Moreover, in some cases, apparently an arbitrary title has been assigned, such as "Calendar of State Papers, Spanish". Occasionally the first significant word of an anonymous title is omitted, which would make it very hard to find in a catalogue (*e.g.*, No. 491). Perhaps more space might have been allowed to the contents of collections. Certainly under *An English Garner* mention should have been made of the Tudor pamphlets separately reprinted and edited by A. F. Pollard.

No doubt it would not be difficult to extend the list of corrigenda or to find things one would rather have otherwise. Nevertheless, this work will fulfill competently the purpose for which it was designed and will be a friend in need alike to the scholar and to the novice.

The Huntington Library. GODFREY DAVIES.

The Celtic Peoples and Renaissance Europe: a Study of the Celtic and Spanish Influences on Elizabethan History. By DAVID MATHEW. With an Introduction by Christopher Dawson. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1933. Pp. xv, 525. $5.00.)

THE title of this book is rather ample for its contents. It confines its attention in the main to that part of Renaissance Europe which was Elizabethan England, and that part of the Celtic peoples which made its home in the

British Isles. Even within these narrower margins it leaves large areas unexplored. It is really a series of essays having to do, for the most part, with the attitude of Scotchmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen toward that system of politics, religion, and culture which the great queen sought to impose upon her dominions. The first fifty pages present a rather penetrating analysis of the weaknesses of the Roman Catholic position in England at the accession of Elizabeth, the last hundred pages an account of Essex's uprising from the point of view of his Celtic affiliations and his feudal sources of strength. Yet there are curiously unrelated chapters like the one on Cornish and Welsh pirates, or the one on the Ordnance Office and Gun-running. There is hardly enough about Spanish influences to justify their inclusion in the title.

The avenue of approach is through the history of particular families, such as the Campbells and the Gordons in Scotland; the Fitzgeralds and the Butlers in Ireland; the Wynnes, the Meyricks, and the Morgans in Wales; the Fitzalans, the Stanleys, and the Manners in England. Father Mathew knows his family history well, and has made wide use of family papers. His paramount interest attaches very evidently to the fate of the Roman Catholic Church, but his treatment of that thorny subject is refreshingly objective and it is not easy to gather from his text where his own loyalties lie. We should certainly never guess that he is a devoted, hard-working Roman Catholic parish priest in Cardiff. It will not do to complain that he does not write about those matters of which he never intended to write, yet it is dangerous to select certain elements in a complex situation for emphasis and to leave other elements altogether unrevealed. This manner of picking and choosing always suggests that the author has formulated his conclusions before beginning to select his facts, and then has selected his facts to support his conclusions. But Father Mathew is never dogmatic and he is not so much concerned with stating definite conclusions as he is with presenting points of view.

The book should not be ignored by students of Tudor history. It calls attention to elements in the social structure of Elizabethan England which have been neglected: feudal elements, racial elements, even tribal elements. We are too much disposed to consider what was new and fresh and forward-looking in those spacious days and to forget how much of what was old persisted. And we are too apt to look at that England from above down, not enough from below up, and certainly not enough from the point of view of the class which got caught between the upper and the nether millstones—the crown and the new economy. We may, without indorsing it in all particulars, profitably utilize Father Mathew's view of the matter as a necessary corrective to the more generally accepted one. We shall certainly do well to emulate his example by paying much greater attention than has been paid to the very considerable body of source material on Tudor history in British family papers.

The University of Pennsylvania. CONYERS READ.

Alexandre Farnèse, prince de Parme, gouverneur général des Pays-Bas, 1545–1592. Par LÉON VAN DER ESSEN, professeur à l'Université de Louvain, membre de la Commission royale d'histoire. Avec une préface par HENRI PIRENNE. Tome I., 1545–1578. (Brussels: Librairie Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire. 1933. Pp. xxxix, 313.)

"ALEXANDER Farnese", writes Professor Van der Essen, "is one of the grandest figures in the history of the sixteenth century. . . . It was because of him that Belgium was destined to remain Roman Catholic. . . . He threw up a barrier between the Catholic south and the Calvinistic north. . . . He was the most redoubtable adversary of William the Silent." And Pirenne remarks in the preface, "Within eight months after the arrival of Farnese, this 'common country' was dissolved. His clairvoyance and his political finesse split asunder the union which his Spanish predecessors had been unable to break up through brutal force of arms." It is rather remarkable that a man of such ability and of such consequence in the political history of Europe in general and of the Low Countries in particular should have received so little attention among Belgian and Dutch historians. Much has been written about William of Orange, for he was the national hero in a country that happened to become and remain for a time the foremost naval, colonial, and commercial power in the world, while the ten provinces in the south declined. Perhaps this was the reason why throughout the nineteenth century the career of Farnese, duke of Parma, seemed of so much less importance than that of the "father of the Dutch Republic".

It was not until 1883 that the first biography of Farnese was published. The author was an Italian, Pietro Fea, and he entitled his work, *Alessandro Farnese*. Unfortunately, he was interested primarily in the military exploits and neglected the political achievements of Farnese. Furthermore, neither in France nor in Germany was the work of Farnese well understood. Pirenne was the first writer to present a proper analysis of the rôle played by him in the field of European politics, but his picture fills but two pages in his *Histoire de Belgique*. An excellent discussion appeared in *The Revolt of the Netherlands* by Professor P. Geyl (1932), but it is brief and does little more than arouse our curiosity. Nothing else would suffice except a detailed study in more than one volume. Consequently, Van der Essen, the secretary of the University of Louvain, after twenty years of painstaking research in numerous archives and libraries, determined to publish such a work. The first volume ends with the year 1578, when Parma succeeded Don Juan of Austria as governor-general of the Netherlands. The second will close with the siege of Antwerp in 1585, and the third will conclude the biography. This scholarly production deserves the highest praise. It is not only well organized and well documented, but it has been well written. It portrays the hero as a product of his age and his environment, leaving nevertheless enough space for the

delineation of his innate talents as military leader and diplomat of the highest order. It may even be surmised that the author was too modest when he stated on the first page of the introduction that Farnese was inferior to William the Silent as a diplomat.

The University of Michigan. A. HYMA.

England's Elizabeth. By MILTON WALDMAN. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1933. Pp. 276. $3.50.)

COMMENTING upon the attitude of writers of history toward Mary Stuart, Conyers Read once remarked that the charms of that ill-fated queen had "aroused the chivalry of many a dull historian and taught him to write better than he knew". The same criticism might well be leveled at Mr. Waldman when he comes to write of Queen Elizabeth—except that he is never dull. It is a remarkable fact that so great a ruler as Elizabeth should have been obliged to wait some three hundred and thirty years for an adequate biography; at its appearance it was hoped that Mr. Waldman's *England's Elizabeth* would make at least partial amends for the failure of historians to do her justice. But it is far from a full-length portrait; and Elizabeth, of all people, requires one if we are ever to comprehend her contradictory and many-sided nature. Like Froude, Mr. Waldman elects to end his study with the defeat of the Spanish Armada, although his detailed picture really stops with the execution of Mary Queen of Scots.

If one wishes to demonstrate the impossibility of true scientific detachment in the writing of history, one need only point to the fact that, with the possible exception of Conyers Read, no historian has yet succeeded in being even decently impartial in considering the rivalry between Queen Elizabeth and Mary Stuart. Those who believe in the integrity of the one must, perforce, blacken the reputation of the other, and those who are swayed by the romantic tragedy of the Scottish queen must represent her southern cousin as "a very Machiavell". It is extraordinary that this should be so, because the greatest of English sovereigns needs no foil to make her greater; the heroic tragedy of Mary Stuart needs no malignant spirit to make her brief career more truly tragic.

Mr. Waldman, an ardent partisan of Elizabeth, can find little to say in praise of Mary except the traditional tribute to her courage. He would have us believe that Elizabeth meant well by Mary and tells us that "there were many who loved Mary as a person: as sovereign the only friend of importance she ever had was the Queen of England". Consequently we are somewhat surprised to find in a later chapter the following statement: "Elizabeth had inveigled Mary, with devilish deliberation, into taking the very husband she had intended for her. She knew Darnley, had long known him, for the worthless scoundrel that he was."

In his desire to free Elizabeth from the suspicion that a large part of her greatness was due to the ability of her privy council, Mr. Waldman fails to give that extremely able body the prominence to which it is entitled historically. Nor would it in any way have detracted from Elizabeth's greatness: modern research has abundantly demonstrated that Elizabeth was subtler and more farsighted than any of her ministers, and that whenever she was obliged to decide against Burghley, Walsingham, and the others, she was more nearly right than they.

One is surprised also to find no clear picture of Elizabeth's relations with Parliament. Her economic legislation, one of the most striking and permanently important aspects of her reign, is scarcely mentioned—a particularly unfortunate omission since the governments of the world at the present time are grappling in much the same way—though less skillfully apparently—with the same fundamental problems which faced Elizabeth. The volume is also inadequate in its treatment of the religious issue. This is the more serious because Walsingham may properly be regarded as the first Puritan to hold high office in England, and Burghley sounded the keynote for most of sixteenth century governmental policy with his often quoted remark, "they who differ in the service of their God will differ in loyalty to their sovereign".

There are some questionable statements such as that Burghley, who was born in 1520, was "bred a Protestant"; but the book, thanks to Mr. Waldman's careful use of sources and his wise reliance for Elizabethan foreign policy on Read's *Walsingham,* is remarkably free from minor errors. Such errors as one discovers are those of emphasis or of interpretation: we are, for example, a little startled to find the Earl of Moray referred to as "an incorruptible politician", and the emphasis on Elizabeth's conscious vision of a great overseas empire is rather dubious. None the less, the book is basically sound, delightfully written, and, considering Mr. Waldman's almost personal devotion to his subject, surprisingly judicial. Incidentally, it is a relief to find a modern popular work on Elizabeth which makes no mention of the various diseases she might have had and does not regard her as a suitable subject for psychoanalysis. One can only regret that, since he has done so well within the limits he set for himself, Mr. Waldman did not choose to complete his picture. Queen Elizabeth still lacks a biographer.

Harvard University. E. A. Whitney.

Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1621–1623. Issued by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury under the Direction of the Master of Rolls. (London: H. M. Stationery Office. 1932. Pp. 598. £1 15*s*.)

This volume is of special interest to students of economic history; it is not without significance for those who would examine the relations between the

privy council and Parliament. The administrative machine was working with less smoothness and precision than earlier. Caesar and Cranfield were good men on a job but had less chance of sway than the Cecils. Those who have read the volumes just preceding must have been impressed with the efforts of the council to reach fair adjustments between conflicting interests, even when it was a conflict between those who had been granted through court favor a new patent and those who were seeking to hold what they had. If the council had given way reluctantly to the Cockayne experiment it was only because James was too much for them. In this volume the council is busy picking up the pieces after that smash, doing what it can to help the clothing counties, when with the foreign market badly cut there could be no real help. The Levant Company and the Muscovy Company were both in straits and the merchants of most companies were suffering from pirates. When the privy council arranged an expedition to suppress the pirates, it had no end of trouble seeing to it that, after the event, the captains were paid their wages.

The privy council developed during the time covered by these records one new piece of administrative machinery. It was in November of 1621 about three weeks before the opening of the autumn session of the Commons that the council named a group of twenty men who were to fall into consideration of the balancing of trade and to report to the council. Of these twenty at least fourteen were members of the House of Commons and six were among the leaders of that House. Sir Dudley Digges and Sir Samuel Sandys had had a great deal to say about trade and now they, Alford, Hakewill, Sir Thomas Wentworth, and others were to serve on an administrative group. Out of that strategy of the council much was to happen. Four months later, there is a report to the council about a request of the Muscovy Company and that request had already been submitted to and approved by the "commissioners of trade". Here is the beginning of those commissions of trade of which the later history has been admirably set forth by C. M. Andrews.

The council seldom forgot Parliament even in the long intervals when that assembly was not meeting. Parliament in this time might well be defined as public opinion brought to bear on the administration. Before, during, and after the Parliament of 1621 the actions of the council were taken with a view to what the men from the shires were likely to demand. Even after the members had gone home and a few to the Tower, their words were still weighty in the precincts of Whitehall. Not by the procedure of impeachment, as much earlier, but by the committee of grievances the Commons were getting a hold on administration. Nowhere more than in these council registers is the growth of the power of Parliament exhibited.

The privy council could not forget the country districts and much of its best work was in straightening out tangles in the counties. There was a

dispute in Bedfordshire over enclosures and two groups bringing actions against one another were involving the interests of others who had not come into the suit. The privy council referred the matter to the justices of assize who thought it inconvenient that every different man involved should be compelled to try and recover his title by special action, and recommended that the matter should be carried before the lord keeper in chancery in such a way that all the cases would be considered together.

In dealing with local matters, however, the privy council had its worries. It had to depend for the carrying out of orders upon the unpaid officials of the country. It would send orders to the justices of peace of a county to remedy an abuse, to mend roads, or to pension lamed soldiers, or what not. A few months later, the council would be again sending out the same orders, with increased emphasis. "There hath not that Reformation followed" that was hoped. Those unpaid country gentlemen, those maids of all work, whom historians have delighted to honor, were not too diligent.

Local communities were hard to move anyway and they were often being asked to go into their pockets. The privy council was not reluctant to ask local authorities to institute and finance local improvements. The repair of the pier and haven of Yarmouth would cost a tidy £14,000 and the council brought pressure to bear upon the mayor and aldermen of Norwich to raise a considerable part of the money.

It is hard to find many general principles in these formal books of orders. Yet it was fundamental with the councilors that men should be kept at work as far as possible, a policy harder to carry out than in Elizabethan times. Helen Manning, a widow of Culmstock in Devon, had been employing three or four hundred people, but because of the decay of clothing had got into trouble with her creditors. The justices of peace were to treat effectually with those creditors so that she might have time for repayment. "We hold it fit that the poor clothier (upon whom depends the livelihood of so many poor people) should receive more than ordinary comfort and encouragement". Hardly less fundamental was the idea that what had been should be. That a certain industry in a village was old was the strongest possible reason for its continuance as against a new project. That was old English. The common law had its business equivalent.

Yale University. WALLACE NOTESTEIN.

Cornwall in the Great Civil War and Interregnum, 1642–1660: a Social and Political Study. By MARY COATE, Fellow and Tutor of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. vi, 414. $6.00.)

FROM the author of an engaging little book on the social life of England in the seventeenth century we now have an important and original study of

Cornwall during twenty turbulent years. This new work is based on careful and exhaustive research and is a book of interest not merely to the local historian; for it is an intensive study of the part which illuminates the whole.

Miss Coate's analysis of the political situation in Cornwall during the Civil War reveals that the county, contrary to a commonly accepted view, was not a subservient royal duchy. Without being a stronghold of Puritanism it had a vigorous parliamentary group from the beginning and the outcome of the Civil War during the first year, fought out in Cornwall on a small scale, was by no means an inevitable royalist triumph. The king's cause won, but only by a narrow margin. What strength there was in Cornish royalism was due primarily to the moderate policy of the Anglican Church in that region and to the devotion of the people to their loyalist social leaders. It is true that the presence of the king in 1644 revived royalist feelings, but not the royalism of passive obedience, and the spirited fighting of the Cornish soldiers in that year was due rather to the primitive desire to defend their own soil and to the continued personal loyalty for the native gentry in the king's army. Nothing so effectively undermined the fighting ardor of the Cornish as the death of their leaders or the advance of the western royalist army too far from Cornwall.

After the parliamentary victory and during the interregnum Miss Coate shows that the gentry class continued to exercise social and political power, for, though the royalist gentry rapidly lost their estates, their eclipse as a party did not lead to the collapse of the landed aristocracy as the leading social class. The landed gentry felt more secure, no doubt, after the Restoration, but it is clear that no social revolution had occurred under the Commonwealth or Protectorate to endanger substantially their traditional power. In religion, however, this period did bring about significant changes in Cornish history. The Quakers and Anabaptists attracted many followers and anticipated the appeal which Methodism was to make to the Cornish people in the eighteenth century. After the Restoration they provided a minority of dissenters to the revived Church of England.

These are a few generalizations from a book full of information about the policies and practices of government in Cornwall, the general character of the people, and the leading figures of the time. One of Miss Coate's finds is the original of the letter from Sir William Waller to Sir Ralph Hopton, dated Bath, June 16, 1643. She is thus able to give in full (and a facsimile is printed) the text of "one of the most poignant documents of the war". In her sketches of Cornwall personalities, from Sir Bevill Grenvile to Hugh Peters, Miss Coate is discriminating and just. Her discussions of the acts of men, whether they be Puritan or Royalist, are the product of intelligent investigation and balanced judgment.

The book contains a useful appendix of documents, lists of members of

Parliament from Cornwall for the period, and an impressive bibliography.
The University of Rochester. WILLSON H. COATES.

Samuel Pepys: the Man in the Making. By ARTHUR BRYANT. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xiv, 436. $3.00.)

IT was a peculiarly fortunate concurrence of circumstances that the materials gathered through a lifetime of investigation by the late Mr. Wheatley should come into the hands of Mr. J. R. Tanner, who in turn spent a lifetime in the study of Mr. Samuel Pepys. But it is little less than a miracle that at the moment Mr. Tanner laid down his task there was, as the seventeenth century Puritan might have said, "raised up" a writer of the skill and charm which Mr. Arthur Bryant possesses to use those materials for this Life of Pepys. It is one of those remarkably rare conjunctions of subject and biographer, with material at his hand, which has not happened certainly since Macaulay fell heir to Sir James Mackintosh's papers. After three generations, as the joint product of two great scholars and a gifted man of letters, we have a biography which is at once accurate and artistic. That it will be popular, the great acclaim with which it has been received already indicates. That it will probably be permanent, its literary charm as well as its scholarship seems to prove. The present volume carries the story only to that fatal year of 1669, the year Pepys's wife died and his eyes forced him to give up his Diary. We have here, then, only the life of the diarist; and we may hope that Mr. Bryant may be as fortunate in his delineation of the Secretary when he is deprived of the services of that amazing and intimate chronicle.

About this book there can be no two opinions. It is a remarkable piece of biographical presentation. One will seek far for a more beautiful chapter than the introduction to this story; perhaps farther still for a delineation of character of equal penetration and equal charm. It is, of course, as it were, a copy of Pepys's portrait of himself, but it is one of those rare cases where the copy seems superior to the original—at least to those who never saw the original. It stresses, consciously or unconsciously, the lighter—or the darker—sides of that original, as it has been printed hitherto, though not, we are informed, as it will be printed hereafter. There is, naturally, much of the work of the office and admirable descriptions of the more serious side of Restoration life and its affairs. But there is more of Pepys's dalliances, his falls from grace, his broken vows, his backslidings, his peccadilloes—and worse—and this is what Pepys was to most of those who read him in the original or in Mr. Bryant's version, and this is why they read. *Autres temps, autres mœurs.* It is quite certain that, even apart from literary style, neither Mr. Wheatley nor Mr. Tanner could, or would, have written such a life of Pepys, but we live in a generation with tastes more akin to those of the Restoration than the Victorians. It is no less certain that Mr. Bryant has

written a biography which will appeal far more to this generation than had it been confined to those matters of more serious importance which would have been deemed proper a generation since. Of that there is no better proof than that we are now promised a new edition of the Diary which will print it *all*.

So far as Mr. Bryant's facts are concerned, his life of Charles II. testifies to his knowledge of the period, especially of the activities of the king and court. What matters lay outside that realm, or even outside the circles in which Pepys moved, are for his purposes no concern of his; nor should they, perhaps, have any place in such biography, save as the background for which Mr. Bryant properly reserves them. They are like the old battles and ships and gardens with which the portrait painters set off and symbolized their subjects in an earlier day. Yet even here the infinite activity and curiosity of Pepys enables him to set his hero in a picture of his times sketched with a light but penetrating touch, under which the Restoration seems to come alive —and yet by no means all of it. Meanwhile we may be grateful for this glimpse and look forward to another of like, although it must be, of a somewhat different sort, if it is to portray the real Pepys.

Harvard University. W. C. Abbott.

The Cambridge History of the British Empire. Volume VII., part I., *Australia;* part II., *New Zealand.* Edited by J. Holland Rose, A. P. Newton, and E. A. Benians. Advisor for the Dominion of Australia, Ernest Scott, Professor of History in the University of Melbourne. Advisor for the Dominion of New Zealand, J. Hight, Litt.D., Rector of Canterbury College, Christchurch, N. Z. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. xix, 759; xiii, 309. $7.00; $3.50.)

The two parts of Volume VII. covering the history of Australia and New Zealand together constitute the fifth to appear of the eight projected volumes of the Cambridge History of the British Empire. Volumes on the Old Empire, India, and Canada and Newfoundland have already been published, those on the Growth of the New Empire and South Africa are in the press, and that on the Empire Commonwealth is still in preparation. So many volumes of Cambridge histories of this and that have appeared in the last thirty years that reviewers and readers of reviews may take certain points for granted. Thus the advantages and disadvantages of writing history cooperatively need no longer be rehearsed. One may assume also competent scholarship, unembroidered style, a concentration of attention on political and economic developments, a valuable classified bibliography, and the usual exasperating Cambridge promise of a later volume of maps.

With few exceptions the chapters of this volume are by Australian writers,

more than half of them present or former members of some university faculty. A fair proportion of space is devoted to the Australian environment, the native races, and the early voyages of discovery and exploration. Until the middle of the nineteenth century the dominant notes in Australian history are convicts, sheep, squatters, exploration, immigration, and growing self-government. Much attention is necessarily given to the reasons for the original settlement, the movement to end transportation, the conflict of interests between the farmer and the herder, and to the various attempts to carry out the plausible theories of Edward Gibbon Wakefield with respect to assisted settlement, the sale of public land, and an adequate labor supply.

With the fifties came the gold discoveries and the consequent doubling of population, responsible self-government, and the beginning of steam transportation. Thereafter interest tends to center around the growing movement toward federation, the increasing determination of some of the colonies to build Australian industries by protective tariffs, the ups and downs of prosperity in the face of periodic droughts and collapsing booms, the increasing importance of frozen mutton and wheat as Australian staples, the formation of a White Australia policy, and the increasing weight of organized labor using its political power to press for economic and social legislation in the various colonies. It is a little disappointing in connection with the last point to find Australian experimentation in such fields as industrial arbitration and taxation treated very briefly and then largely as incidental to the story of the rise and fall of ministries.

The twentieth century has seen the Commonwealth established, and the immediate emergence of problems of centralization as against state rights. An American reader of the chapters describing the constitution and its workings and the political developments up to 1914 finds much that seems familiar in the steady advance of the powers exercised by the federal government. The High Court is in a position not unlike that of the Supreme Court in the United States in that it must regularly decide whether federal legislation goes beyond constitutional limitations. The High Court however seems ready to reverse earlier decisions in shorter order, and with less concern for the appearance of entire consistency. It is interesting to note the comment (p. 482) that "the state of the authorities points to the predominance of the British parliamentary principle as against federalism as interpreted in the United States. A practical illustration is found in the substantial disuse of American authorities in argument to-day, while in the earlier years of the court the *Reports* of the Supreme Court of the United States formed part of the library of every man in leading practice at the bar."

The chapter on Australia and the Empire, and the section devoted to Australia's military part of the Great War both suffer from the disadvantage of presenting fragmentary local aspects of much larger movements. Apart

from the connected development of British colonial policy as a whole, a subject presumably to be treated in Volumes II. and III., it is hard to grasp the constitutional significance of the events described in the separate colonies. It is even more difficult to make anything out of the war from a purely Australian point of view. The same difficulties arise in the corresponding chapters on New Zealand.

The history of New Zealand is naturally treated in briefer compass than that of the larger dominion. Environment, natives, and discovery and exploration are interestingly discussed, with an additional chapter on the missionaries. An unusual note in the history of contacts with non-European races is struck by the declaration that there is at present no race discrimination against the Maoris either in private or public life and by the judgment expressed (p. 250) that "proud, highly intelligent, brave and self-conscious, the Maori people could be completely absorbed without detriment to the social and moral standards of the New Zealanders". The Maoris however number only four per cent of the population.

The complicated and rather confusing story of how a reluctant British government was brought to annex the islands is told. The volume then describes constitutional and economic development, the relations with the Maoris, and political parties and state experiments. In view of the widespread opinion that New Zealand has gone far along the road of State Socialism the comment of a dominion student (p. 197) is important: "Upon analysis most of the so-called State Socialism of Australia and New Zealand proves to be, not so much a considered scheme for social reorganization, as a general readiness to use the machinery of Government for sectional advantage, irrespective of economic and political consequences." The concluding chapter and epilogue on social life and culture in New Zealand seem of greater general interest than the corresponding more detailed chapter on Australian culture.

In the opinion of the present reviewer this volume, as well as the others in the series, would gain in value if an introductory or concluding chapter swept together the material, pointed out the main lines of development, related the history of the dominions to that of the empire as a whole, and reminded the reader briefly that even British expansion is but a part of the still greater movement of European expansion. Something of this ground is covered in the all too brief prefaces by the general editors, but twenty pages would be better than two.

The University of Chicago. ARTHUR P. SCOTT.

The Discoverers of the Fiji Islands: Tasman, Cook, Bligh, Wilson, Bellingshausen. By G. C. HENDERSON, M.A., Emeritus Professor of History, Adelaide University. (London: John Murray. 1933. Pp. xviii, 324. 18*s*.)

Professor Henderson, with other works on Fiji to his credit, has worked through manuscripts and charts in Australia, England, Holland, and France, to shed further light on the exploits of those courageous seamen who discovered the various islands of the Fiji archipeligo. The outstanding feature of the work is the supplementing of the literary approach by practical field work. With the coöperation of the commanders of trading ships and British warships, the author has voyaged over the routes of the early explorers. He has viewed the various islands and the mazes of coral reefs as from the decks of the early ships. He has thus identified himself with the problems of navigation and, realizing the serious dangers that beset his heroes, he has been able to interpret their actions with sympathy and understanding. Throughout he has had the expert advice of master mariners and he has given them due credit.

The galaxy of approved discoverers include Tasman (1643), Cook (1774), Bligh (1789 and 1792), Wilson (1797), and Bellingshausen (1820). Each explorer is allowed to tell his own story by log and chart. Copious footnotes explain obscurities and give islands and reefs their present names. A large pocket map based on British admiralty charts shows the various routes and is invaluable for comparison with the original charts of the explorers.

Tasman obtains credit for priority and is placed second to Bligh for the importance of his discoveries. The author displays neat detective work in tracing the source of "the Great Chart of the South Seas" which influenced Tasman in changing his course to the north to avoid New Guinea. Cook's southerly route added but one island. Bligh, in his epic voyage in the launch of the *Bounty,* traversed the archipeligo from S. E. to N. W. and, even without his later voyage, he thus made the greatest and most important discoveries. The lesser contributions of Wilson and Bellingshausen are fully dealt with. A number of other discoverers are disposed of.

The author's admiration for Bligh's conduct during the voyage of the launch of the *Bounty* leads him to attribute the disaffection of the mutineers to demoralization through the luxuries of Tahiti rather than to the harsh character of Bligh. The natives of the South Seas seem to provide convenient scapegoats for the excesses of people of higher culture. The fact that Bligh rose to such heights of self-control on the *Bounty's* launch does not necessarily imply that he exercised the same self-control on the *Bounty's* quarter deck.

Unfortunately but two of the discoverers made contact with the Fijians. Bligh, on his second voyage, obtained some weapons and mentioned outrigger canoes, shell ornaments, and finger mutilation. Bellingshausen gave the fullest picture from the most southern island of Ono-i-lau. He collected and figured a good assortment of weapons and recorded the first list of native words. The author's statement that the words "puaka" (pig) and "koli"

(dog) are derived respectively from "porker" and "collie" is somewhat curious because the words "puaka" and "kuli" are widespread Polynesian words applied to the pig and the dog long before contact with Europeans.

The work is a scientific historical treatise by an author of proved reputation and as such is a valuable addition to the literature of Fiji and the Pacific area.

Yale University. PETER H. BUCK.

Histoire constitutionnelle de la France de 1789 à 1870. Par MAURICE DESLANDRES, professeur de droit constitutionnel, doyen honoraire de la Faculté de droit de Dijon. Deux tomes. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1932. Pp. 794; 766. 190 fr.)

IN the United States the vogue of constitutional history has disappeared. The once swollen stream of books and articles on constitutional themes has dwindled to a mere trickle. Interest has shifted from institutions to men. Biography holds the field. The public demands, or is supposed to demand, that history be written in the form of biography, or at any rate with the biographical approach. M. Deslandres, it is evident, must be confident that France has not undergone a corresponding change. His two big volumes contain about 625,000 words. It is a large order, even for a voracious appetite. Fortunately it is well seasoned and attractively garnished in the best French manner. Style, organization, and emphasis leave little to be desired.

M. Deslandres is a professor of law at the University of Dijon. In his preface, however, he is at some pains to explain that his purpose is not the presentation of a theoretical or juridical system. He writes as a historian whose study has led him to hold certain beliefs about the series of fourteen different régimes which in the eighty-one years between 1789 and 1870 for a time governed France. He is particularly impressed with the belief that each régime owed its existence, its *modus operandi,* and its span of life to the living forces of its day rather than to the merits or demerits of the theories upon which it rested. In carrying on his investigation and in arriving at his results he claims to have made impartiality his guiding principle and rule of judgment.

The claim is justified to a surprisingly large degree. He has a point of view; occasionally it appears to have led him into unduly severe judgments, especially as to the régimes of the Convention and of the Napoleons; but it appears to have come from the process of applying his general conclusions rather than from prejudice or preconception. His point of view may be defined as that of a convinced republican of the Third Republic who believes that the present system of government has exhibited a capacity to adapt itself to the changing needs of France in a way not attained by any of its predecessors and that in this adaptability lies its best title to live and to rule.

By that standard he judges the earlier systems. Each of them failed, he holds, because each lacked adaptability.

The most striking feature of M. Deslandres's book is perhaps its broad scope. Believing that each of the fourteen régimes with which he deals was at all stages shaped by the interplay of the dominating forces of its time, he has felt compelled to include a great deal not ordinarily to be found in constitutional histories. Most of this matter is political history. In places there is a little about foreign policy. But economic and cultural forces are almost entirely neglected. Much of the political history is given in distinct sections by way of preliminary to the constitutional history. A good deal of it is then repeated in briefer form at the points in the constitutional narrative where interplay operates. The method makes for emphasis and clarity, but involves much repetition and accounts in no small degree for the size of the book.

In the strictly constitutional portions M. Deslandres bases his work on original research, supplemented by an extensive use of monographs and special studies. For the rest, his method is to rely mainly upon a few well chosen guides used with discretion. These are usually the leading histories of limited periods. At some points he has made effective use of a few newspapers, especially the *Journal des Débats* for the Second Republic and the Second Empire. His success in handling that difficult material makes the reviewer regret that he has not made more extensive use of it.

In a striking conclusion M. Deslandres sums up some of his interpretation. From 1789 to 1814 was a time of chronic revolution. From 1814 to 1870, save for an eclipse from 1851 to 1869, *"c'est au fond un même régime, le parlementarisme, qui règne avec, il est vrai, des réalisations fort diverses"* (II. 732). As that system has continued under the Third Republic, he concludes that there has been far more stability about French political institutions than is usually recognized. In the light of that circumstance he denies that the French are a revolutionary people. It is a conclusion which appears to the reviewer well founded. If accepted and widely disseminated it would contribute not a little to a better understanding of France and its history.

Dartmouth College. FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

Correspondance entre le comte de Gobineau et le comte de Prokesch-Osten, 1854–1876. Publiée par CLÉMENT SERPEILLE DE GOBINEAU. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1933. Pp. iv, 407. 36 fr.)

Two of the last representatives of the *ancien régime* aristocrat, one an Austrian and one a Frenchman, viewed a stirring world from Olympian heights during the period of the Crimean, Franco-Austrian, Danish, Austro-Prussian, and Franco-Prussian wars. One was the Comte de Prokesch-Osten, once the friend of "Napoleon II.", the Duke of Reichstadt; Austrian diplo-

matic representative at Athens, Berlin, the Frankfort Diet, and Constantinople. The other was the Comte de Gobineau, also diplomat, Orientalist and perpetual traveler, but famous chiefly for his essay on the inequality of the races of man, a storehouse of ammunition for Aryanists and Nordicists ever since. We learn that in 1855 it was considered an "engine of war" against the abolitionists in the United States (p. 9), but the admission is made with a quiet chuckle as though Gobineau did not take even his own disciples very seriously. The range of interest and travel of the two friends is astonishing. Letters are dated from Alexandria, Cairo, Aden, Teheran, Constantinople, Newfoundland, Athens, Rio de Janeiro, Stockholm, and a dozen other cities. That this is not the superficial cosmopolitanism of the globe-trotter but the detachment from local ties of two "citizens of the world" every page bears witness.

This very detachment subtracts somewhat from the value of the letters for the political historian. The two statesmen held many important diplomatic posts. Prokesch was an antagonist of Bismarck at the Frankfort Diet, he lost a son in the war against Denmark (p. 254); Gobineau, though less continuously in professional diplomatic service, represented the government of Napoleon III. on several important missions. Yet in 1859 Prokesch drops a scornful "Poor Piedmont . . . to have a Cavour for minister" (p. 196) and then eagerly turns to the more congenial topics of cuneiform inscriptions and ancient Persian art. In 1866 there are many pages on the religion of Babism; only a few lines on the policy of Prussia. Both men frequently confess themselves "bored" with Europe and they turn with a fresh enthusiasm toward the Orient. Probably the most valuable part of the book consists in its observations and comments on the reaction of Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan (p. 78) to European imperialism. This disgust with Europe seems to have been mainly due to the democratic movement, which both held in utter loathing. Prokesch's comment in 1872 is quite characteristic of that vanished generation of Old World statesmen who had little or no prejudice of nationality but every prejudice of caste: "I despair of France. She abhors the only remedy which might save and restore her. That would be a return to the principles destroyed in 1789. With her legitimate king and white banner she would take at one step her place in Europe, which neither the house of Orleans nor the anarchy which calls itself the republic can bring her" (p. 350).

The University of Michigan. PRESTON SLOSSON.

Die auswärtige Politik Preussens, 1858–1871. Band I., *November 1858 bis Dezember 1859.* Bearbeitet von Dr. CHRISTIAN FRIESE. Bände III., IV., *Oktober 1862 bis April 1864.* Von Dr. RUDOLF IBBEKEN. [Diplomatische Aktenstücke, herausgegeben von der His-

torischen Reichskommission unter Leitung von Erich Brandenburg, Otto Hoetzsch, Hermann Oncken.] (Oldenburg i. O.: Gerhard Stalling. 1933; 1932; 1933. Pp. 858; 831; 776. 45.50 M.; 44 M.; 42 M.)

THESE volumes are the first fruits of the work of the *Historische Reichskommission*. Founded in 1928 under the chairmanship of Friedrich Meinecke, it set itself the task of examining, editing, and publishing the sources for the history of the German Empire and of its immediate antecedents. A subcommittee (Professors Erich Brandenburg, Otto Hoetzsch, and Hermann Oncken) was appointed to supervise the first project, the publication of the documentary material on Prussian foreign policy from 1858 to 1871. Professor Hoetzsch has assumed the responsibility for the first part of the series, two volumes covering the period from the beginning of the "New Era" in November, 1858, to the calling of Bismarck in September, 1862; Professor Oncken for the second, five volumes from September, 1862, to the peace with Austria in August, 1866; Professor Brandenburg for the third, five volumes from August, 1866, to the peace with France in 1871. Younger scholars, Dr. Christian Friese, Dr. Rudolf Ibbeken, and Dr. Herbert Michaelis, respectively, have been entrusted with the actual gathering and editing of the documents.

This new collection forms the logical background for and introduction to the volumes already published on German foreign policy from 1871 to 1914, *Die grosse Politik der europäischen Kabinette*. Like *Die grosse Politik*, and indeed, the *Monumenta* of the early nineteenth century, this publication is designed to satisfy not merely a historical but also a national need. "Auch diese Aufgabe der historischen Forschung ist zugleich eine nationale Ehrenpflicht und ein politisches Bedürfnis. Wenn man die Welt instand gesetzt hatte, die Aussenpolitik des Reiches seit seinem Bestehen, so wie sie in Wirklichkeit war, kennenzulernen, dann ergab sich als die nächtste Aufgabe, volles Licht in gleichem Masse über die Politik zu verbreiten, vermöge deren dieses Reich sich inmitten der europäischen Staatengesellschaft erhoben und trotz aller Gegenwirkungen durchgesetzt hatte." The names of the scholars responsible for the publication offer, however, adequate assurance that this political object will be achieved without detriment to the scholarly value of the work. It is sincerely to be hoped that the new régime in Germany will not interfere with the completion of the work in the spirit in which it has been begun.

The larger part of the material comes from the Prussian archives. It is supplemented by a substantial number of documents from other European archives, notably those of London, Moscow, Paris, and Vienna. The archives of Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Turin also contribute much of value. In view of the long promised Italian publication on the period after 1861, however, the Italian material for that period could be printed only in summary. For the period of the North German Confederation, more will be

drawn from the archives of the German middle states, but the German question is included only in so far as it influenced the other powers or was related to the conflict of Prussia and Austria as European Great Powers. Professor Srbik of Vienna is preparing to publish the documents on the German question.

The editing is excellent. The chronological order as used in the great French documentary publications has been adopted instead of the topical arrangement employed in *Die grosse Politik*. There are ample cross references, chronological lists of the documents quoted in the notes as well as those printed in the main body of the work, indexes of the senders and receivers of dispatches and of the principal persons mentioned. Except in the case of Bismarck's official papers, Oncken's *Rheinpolitik*, *Das Staatsarchiv*, and *Les origines diplomatiques*, no attempt has been made to give references to the historical literature of the period even when based on documents included in this collection nor to indicate which documents have been published before.

It is obviously impossible to publish all of the material in the archives on a given theme. From the non-German sources, the editors have chosen especially documents reporting conversations with Prussian statesmen or bearing directly on Prussian policy. The reviewer can testify, however, from his own work in various archives from the period 1862 to 1864, that the selection has been made with good judgment and discrimination.

It is equally impossible in anything short of a series of articles to do more than to indicate what is new or of especial interest in the three large volumes before us. The Italian war is the main theme of Volume I. which shows in considerable detail the attempts to prevent the war and the misunderstanding that developed in Austro-Prussian relations. Volume III. includes new material on Austro-Prussian relations and especially on the Polish crisis of 1863. The documents on the Polish question before the Alvensleben Convention throw new light on the origins of that much-vexed problem. In Volume IV., the Schleswig-Holstein question holds the center of the stage. Here the most novel contributions come from the Russian and Swedish archives.

Since the general opening of archives that followed the War of 1914–1918, much of the material presented has been accessible for scholars and some of it has been used for articles and books. It is of real value, however, both for seminar exercises and for more serious studies to have so many new documents to supplement those previously published in scattered places.

The University of Minnesota. LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL.

Fondation de l'État indépendant du Congo: Un chapitre de l'histoire du partage de l'Afrique. Par ROBERT STANLEY THOMSON, professeur d'histoire à Russell Sage College. (Brussels: Office de Publicité. 1933. Pp. 354.)

STUDENTS of history who refer glibly to the "scramble for Africa" would find on reading Professor Thomson's admirable study of the founding of the Congo Free State that the phrase in question suggests an ease in partitioning Africa that never existed. European countries seeking to occupy territory had more to do than merely to reach in and claim land for themselves. The great labors preceding the founding of the Congo Free State form the theme of Professor Thomson's book, which was made possible by the Educational Board established by the Commission for the Relief of Belgium. The work is a carefully documented study. It belongs essentially to the field of diplomatic history, for it is an account of the international activity of Leopold II. of Belgium, who was seeking to win his indifferent country to a colonial program. The book ends, therefore, in the year 1885; the later history of Leopold's African kingdom, made familiar to the world by the revelations of E. D. Morel and Roger Casement, is not included.

The hero of the story is Leopold. And one notes with pleasure that the author's admiration for this shrewd and energetic king does not incline him to follow blindly the precept *de mortuis nihil nisi bonum*. It was Leopold who created Belgium's colonial empire, although one wonders whether more might not be told of the bankers and traders who coöperated with him. By a diplomatic appeal to internationalism and humanitarianism Leopold took the first step in 1876, when he summoned famous geographers and explorers to Brussels and founded the *Association internationale africaine*, with national committees in the member states. Of these committees that of Belgium played the leading rôle; but the scheme did not work well. So in 1878 with the aid of bankers and traders Leopold took the second step, the formation of the *Comité d'études du Haut-Congo*. Leopold himself contributed a good deal of money to the funds of the *Comité*, which chose Stanley for the work of exploring the Upper Congo. In spite of the great secrecy maintained about the activity and purposes of this organization, it apparently failed to achieve its goal. French commercial rivalry and exploring activity forced Leopold to take the third step, the formation of the *Association internationale du Congo*. With the assistance of H. S. Sanford, a former minister of the United States to Belgium, and with a questionable deviation from strict truth, Leopold succeeded in winning American recognition for the territory acquired by his *Association* in central Africa. This curious state was not generally recognized by the time of the Berlin Congo Conference of 1884–1885, where it was represented in the minds of the delegates only as *"la belle dame de nos pensées"*. Long and shrewdly conducted negotiations finally overcame the pardonable hesitancy of the major European powers, who finally granted the desired recognition. Confronted thus with accomplished facts, Belgium accepted the Congo Free State, its only link with the latter being the person of Leopold II.

The American character of this study is now and then evident in charac-

teristic expressions that are not fully concealed by the French rendition of the text. Additional material has been made available since the author made his researches. Foreign office papers are now accessible through the year 1885; a study of them might necessitate some changes in that part of the story based on published Blue Books and the Slave Trade Papers of 1876–1877. But only the opening of the archives in Brussels will make possible the definitive account yet to be given.

Yale University. H. R. RUDIN.

War Memoirs of David Lloyd George. Volume I., 1914–1915; volume II., 1915–1916. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1933. Pp. vii, 469; 449. $4.00 each.)

HERE is a stirring epic of the World War, in which a twentieth century St. George engages in fierce combat with the dragon of ineptitude. No principal actor in the strife played a more influential rôle or was better placed to comprehend the entire play than Lloyd George; like Mr. Britling, he saw it through. No leading actor has produced so dramatic and personal an account. Postdating most of his contemporaries in writing memoirs, he has fewer revelations, perhaps, but he has the more inclusive view, and he has the last word. As a contemporary historical document his book has its defects, but it is invaluable as a source for the study of war. However provocative of controversy the character and conduct of the author may be, there is no challenging the variety of his contacts with the many-sidedness of war, his quick and keen perception of values, and his alert understanding of the human problems raised by war. Few books bring together so authoritatively and so vividly the innumerable thoughts, emotions, and deeds which constitute the direction of modern warfare.

To the lively imagination and impatient realism of Lloyd George, early in the struggle, came the conviction that the Allies, particularly Britain, had no comprehensive policy based on concerted or rational planning, and that the conduct of operations was a drifting, hand-to-mouth procedure. Danger threatened, not only from foreign enemies, but also from an insidious menace permeating all wars—stupidity, waste, and the rivalry of prejudices, policies, and personalities. To such an extent did these forms of ineptitude flourish in Britain, buttressed as they were by pride, tradition, and tenacity, that Lloyd George was apparently convinced that he alone could vanquish them, and that like Pitt, he was the only man who could save the country. With inexhaustible energy and brisk intolerance of opposition he fought to arouse the nation, to make the government an effective war machine, to goad the military authorities into a comprehension of the magnitude of their task, and in every way to convert easy-going, time-wasting, conventional processes into rapid, efficient achievements.

His mind was not obsessed with reverence for established practices and it was frequently inspired by flashes which revealed much broader horizons than those compassed by routine or professional minds. Thus, sooner than most, particularly the soldiers, he saw with provocative intensity that the war would be essentially a conflict of material—of munitions and supplies—a duel between the productive ability of Allied labor and that of the Central Powers. He embarked on a campaign for munitions, the success of which was so complete and tangible that it has somewhat overshadowed his tireless inspiration in other spheres. In this effort the most obnoxious resistance came from the conservatism, unimaginative stubbornness, red tape, and caste tradition of infallibility of the military professionals in the war office and ordnance department. Lloyd George's capacity "for amazement at professional repugnance to new ideas or formations . . . reached the saturation point"; he had to contend, in fact, "not with a profession but with a priesthood, devoted to its chosen idol". In the matter of the number and importance of heavy guns, of the quantity and use of high explosives, and of the number and significance of both machine guns and tanks, his prevision far exceeded that of military men (this his dated documents, memoranda, and letters prove) and in these matters his will triumphed. But perhaps his greatest credit lies in conceiving and providing for a munitions industry, with organization and machine tools, capable of expansion far beyond the immediate range of vision.

When the results of the military campaigns alarmed and shocked Lloyd George, as disproportionate to the power and legitimate expectations of the Allies, he refused to accept the explanations of the professional soldiers or to be impressed by the mystery of the military craft. With the presumption of a "meddlesome politician", he plunged deliberately into the realm of strategy. The ancient problem of the relations of civilian and military control (recently so ably discussed by General Sir Frederick Maurice in his *Government and War*) is forcibly and instructively illustrated in Lloyd George's book. With a simplicity which was, perhaps, too simple but with a logic and freshness which seem to your reviewer convincingly sound, Lloyd George contended, in advance, for a strategy in 1915 which was superior to that which was so disastrously adopted. He grasped intelligently and betimes the extent to which modern warfare had invalidated the sacrosanct maxims anent offense and defense, anent the concentration of force in the main theater of war. To his comprehensive view the main theater of the war should lie where major results could be obtained; these, he held, were in Russia and the Balkans. He saw them not as isolated factors or areas but as parts of the whole problem of man power, resources, and material. Unhypnotized by the "blood red sun of the West", he advocated an adequately prepared offensive via Albania or Salonika, or both, to dominate the Balkans

and assist Russia. After all, the Germans were violating the canon of the main theater by "holding" on the Western front and attacking in the East. Why should the Allies with superior power be less successful in doing the same?

In the acrid dispute among "Eastern fronters, Western fronters, and side-show advocates", Lloyd George did not come off second best. To Field Marshal Robertson's "Every fool knows that you cannot be too strong at the decisive point" [*viz.*, the Western front], he replies, "but every wise man also knows that the decisive point is the one at which you have the best chance of beating your enemy with the least risk and at the lowest cost, and that only 'every fool' would deliberately choose to fight him at the point which presents the greatest difficulty . . . 'every fool' would also know that the attack at the decisive point must be made at the decisive moment". The correctness of Lloyd George's contention will always involve a tantalizing historical "if". But the subsequent course of the war, notably in such aspects as the transport muddle behind the Western front, the Mesopotamian operations of so much tragedy and horror—that "veritable Paradise of the Brass Hat" in which the soldiers without civilian interference ran the show—and the bloody failures of 1916, 1917, and 1918 went far to justify the "meddlesome politician".

Rebuffed by the generals in 1915, Lloyd George turned his attention to the question of the supreme war control and with step-by-step persistence succeeded in improving that of Britain; he ultimately secured a concentration in the War Cabinet, and made himself, as prime minister, a war dictator. It is not unfair to hold that, even as the nature and problems of warfare were modified by the influence of supplies and material, the requirements of effective direction were changing; Lloyd George's injection of civilian authority into military considerations was neither such an egregious calamity as some generals would have us believe, nor the least of his contributions to Allied victory. His narrative of the cabinet crisis which ended Asquith's ministry is too brief to be definitive but it reveals, in conjunction with Beaverbrook's *Politicians and the War,* a less sinister background than was formerly suspected. The decline of the Liberal party was inevitable for, as Lloyd George remarks, "war has always been fatal to Liberalism"; and his own conviction that he alone could lead Britain to a saving victory, is sufficient motive to explain his attitude to the "miasma of indecision" which beclouded the Asquith government.

Negotiations with Ireland following the Easter rebellion, labor complications, conscription, liquor control, "premature peace" discussions, the pooling of Allied resources, relations with the United States, and food supplies are some of the other concerns which Lloyd George records. These are recounted with vivacity and cogency, if not always with impartiality. His

sympathetic dealing with labor, employing a minimum of threat and coercion, was an indispensable contribution to his country's strength; his exposition of the peace moves, the memoranda of Lansdowne and Balfour and the "military" peace terms of Robertson is reasonable and fair, and historically important. His interpretation of President Wilson's position is much more intelligent than that of most European contemporaries; it is that of a politician who understands and is sympathetic, but is not moved to admiration; Lloyd George possessed too much in common with Theodore Roosevelt, with whom he occasionally exchanged amenities, to admire Wilson.

Highly interesting and valuable are Lloyd George's epigrammatic and trenchant personal sketches of his co-workers—among them Grey, Kitchener, Robertson, Geddes, Balfour, Carson, Haldane, and notably Bonar Law with whom he entered, as Stanley Baldwin asserted, "the most perfect partnership in political history". Rarely does Lloyd George forget his lowly origin as distinguished from that of his colleagues born in the tradition of the governing aristocracy. He dramatizes this contrast in a picture of Balfour, on the steps of the gilt throne of Queen Anne—unoccupied since the death of the last Stuart sovereign—intimately confronting, for the first time, a Trades Union deputation. For the humble worker he has a genuine sympathy. Note the difference between his feelings during a conversation with the elated Joffre and Haig, just after the first evanescent successes of the Somme (which they promised "ecstatically" to win in a few days with cavalry), and his emotions fired by an account of heroic women whose obscure contribution to victory was the adjustment of defective shell fuses, "carrying on" after a terrible, death-dealing explosion.

Neither the *ex parte* character of Lloyd George's *pièce justificative,* with its sometimes brash generalizations and facile assurance, nor surfeit of war literature should deter students of statesmanship or of war from an acquaintance with this book.

Amherst College. LAURENCE B. PACKARD.

Peacemaking, 1919: being Reminiscences of the Paris Peace Conference. By HAROLD NICOLSON. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1933. Pp. vii, 378. $4.50.)

"THE purpose of this book is . . . not so much to formulate a record of events, as to catch, before it evaporates, the unhealthy and unhappy atmosphere of the Peace Conference; to convey some impression of that gradual drift, away from our early peaks of aspiration towards the low countries where figures laboured hurriedly together in a gathering fog . . .; my sole endeavour is to recapture states of mind."

The volume is composed of two parts, Book I., "As it seems to-day", written recently, and Book II., "As it seemed then". The latter part, slightly

less than half in bulk of the volume, is made up of extracts from the author's diary, written during the conference. Technically imperfect, in that selections only are printed, and that even these passages are written up from abbreviated memoranda, the diary invites some skepticism. I can only record my personal conviction of its integrity, based on considerable intercourse with Nicolson at the conference. Nothing else known to me conveys so accurately and so effectively the feelings of a subordinate engaged in the peace negotiations—his hopes and doubts, his moods and his distractions. Book II. is a valuable historical document.

Book I. must be judged differently. Starting with the admission "I can make no claim to recapture any state of mind other than my own" the author proceeds to lay bare the thoughts of other people at the conference. To him, as to Keynes years ago and to many others in the interval, the complex workings of Mr. Wilson's mind seem to be no secret. M. Poireau himself could not more effectively explain the happenings of the conference by reference to the little grey cells. The narrative has the interest—and the historical value—of a detective story. To prove or to disprove the author's theses is equally impossible. This, at least, may be asserted, that if the author's ability as a mind reader is measured by his success in reading the minds of the American territorial advisers he is an unsafe guide. He pictures them as having their confidence shaken by the November elections, "the ghost disturbing all their feasts", and then progressively eaten away; "the suspicion that America was asking Europe to make sacrifices to righteousness which America would never make, and had never made, herself, produced a mood of diffidence, uncertainty and increasing despair". Personal recollections, checked by reference to my colleagues, recall an entirely different state of mind. American politics played practically no part in their thoughts. Some of them, like Nicolson, felt the nervous strain of the conference, and had their ups and downs of feeling. Some of them, oddly enough, found in him the same faults as a negotiator (cloudiness, vacillation), which he found in them. Most of them were wrapped up in the work of the day, and believed to the end that they were getting results—admittedly imperfect, but the best to be got under the circumstances.

The circumstances of the conference offer the author material for a discussion much more definite and much more valuable than his account of its psychology. He states his main thesis early in the book. "Given the atmosphere of the time, given the passions aroused in all democracies by four years of war, it would have been impossible even for supermen to devise a peace of moderation and righteousness." The conference was late in assembling and late in settling down to work. "Of our wholly unavoidable misfortunes, the most dominant was democratic opinion." "The second wholly unavoidable misfortune of the Paris Conference was that the pleni-

potentiaries of the five Great Powers each occupied a political position, was each representative of some alert but ignorant electorate." "The presence of President Wilson in Paris was a serious misfortune." The choice of Paris for the meeting was a blunder, but inevitable.

There were other difficulties which the author thinks might have been avoided and which are treated in a chapter headed Mistakes. The Fourteen Points did not provide a firm basis for the conduct of the conference. No definite program of procedure had been agreed upon. For more than ten weeks no decision was made whether the treaty under discussion was to be preliminary or final, was to be negotiated or imposed. In regard to organization the author offers an interesting estimate. "I should say that some 30 per cent of the total energy of the Supreme Council was taken up by executive functions, that some 10 per cent was wasted on unnecessary detail, and that some 40 per cent was devoted to preventing a breach between one or other of the Allies. The remaining 20 per cent was expended upon the task of making peace."

Admirably written, the book should be, and doubtless will be, widely read; when judged most critically it is still interesting and suggestive.

Yale University. CLIVE DAY.

Modern Germany: a Study of Conflicting Loyalties. By PAUL KOSOK, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Long Island University. [Studies in the Making of Citizens.] (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1933. Pp. xiii, 348. $3.00.)

Germany enters the Third Reich. By CALVIN B. HOOVER. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1933. Pp. 241. $2.50.)

DR. KOSOK starts from the assumption that German civic training is not to be regarded as a means of uniting citizens and groups into an all-embracing national community, but rather as a method employed by the ruling bourgeoisie to break the class loyalities of the non-bourgeois groups. According to his view, the main problem is the way by which the middle class German state was able, both before and after the War, to bring the bulk of organized labor to accept "bourgeois property, bourgeois society, and the bourgeois state". The chief instrument in bringing this about appears to him to have been the Social Democratic party, "a bulwark of the bourgeois state and society already in 1914" (p. 77). In the last years it has been the disinherited middle class which threatens to abandon its allegiance to the bourgeois state. Dr. Kosok thinks it is now the National Socialists who have taken upon themselves the task of keeping the middle and lower classes from becoming revolutionary, which in his mind would be equivalent to lining up with the Communists.

Anyone who questions the basic conception of the book—more explicitly and aggressively expressed in the chapter written by Isodor Ginsburg on

"national symbolism"—must necessarily object to many of Dr. Kosok's interpretations. His approach to the subject has, however, the advantage that it has led to a thorough study both of the history and the sociological significance of all such institutions as the German political parties, the civil service, the army, the schools, and the churches. These are treated as instruments of civic training, and at the same time as expressions of the deep-reaching processes of social and political evolution through which Germany has passed since the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Professor Hoover's book tells how the National Socialists came into power, how they acted in the first months of their rule, and what are the main principles upon which they base their movement and their government. While thoroughly out of sympathy with National Socialism, the author tries to be dispassionate, feeling that the standards of a "liberal peace-time society" cannot be applied to a world so different both in conditions and ideals. Like Dr. Kosok, he emphasizes the economic factors. "It was the hostility of the people based upon economic grounds", he writes (p. 31), "which gave the mass weight to the movement". He too blames the Social Democrats, whose policy, he claims, had resulted in no real progress whatever toward the announced goal of socialism. The opposition to the capitalist system passed from the proletariat, which lacked leadership, to the disinherited middle classes. Professor Hoover does not agree with those who regard the National Socialists' economic program as being vague and meaningless, but thinks that "a new type of economic system may evolve out of the present embryonic form of National Socialism" (p. 209). With reference to the international consequences, he is full of apprehension. He bases his judgment of Germany's future foreign policy largely upon the books which Adolf Hitler and Alfred Rosenberg wrote long before the party came into power. He also assumes that Germany has unequaled military abilities.

Yale University. ARNOLD WOLFERS.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Tercentenary Pamphlets. Issued by the Committee on Historical Publications, Tercentenary Commission of the State of Connecticut, CHARLES M. ANDREWS, Chairman, 1931—June, 1933, GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER, Chairman. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1933.)

IT is a novel program which the Committee on Historical Publications of the Connecticut Tercentenary Commission has adopted to celebrate the approaching anniversary. The scheme is modest, surely, as compared with such an enterprise as the Illinois centennial history; but it is in keeping with the times, and it has fallen into capable hands. The committee plans

to issue in the next few years a series of pamphlets in attractive format, designed for a lay audience of intelligent readers, to deal with a wide variety of subjects in the history of the state. A score have already been published, including the well-digested *Instructions to Contributors* (1932, pp. 3). They range in point of time and theme from aboriginal history, in *The Indians of Connecticut* (pp. 33) by Mathias Spiess, to the well-told story of *The Discoverer of Anaesthesia: Dr. Horace Wells of Hartford* (pp. 13) by Henry W. Erving. It is gratifying to discover that throughout tradition, legend, and local bias have been excluded, in keeping with the rules laid down by the committee; and that in general the appeal for those literary qualities which will attract readers has also been kept in view. The sketch of the Indians would have profited in this respect by editorial revision. In contrast is the effective narrative of Indian warfare in Howard Bradstreet's *The Story of the War with the Pequots, Re-Told* (pp. 32). In deference to another prejudice of the general reader the contributors have availed themselves but sparingly of a restricted permission to use footnotes; in a number of the pamphlets, however, brief bibliographies appear.

The plan to print significant documents is represented thus far only by *The Charter of Connecticut, 1662* (pp. 22), which is textually reproduced with great fidelity, and has prefatory notes by Albert C. Bates and Charles M. Andrews; the latter writes on the passage through the seals. Biographies as such are barred, but a judicious sketch of *Thomas Hooker* (pp. 19) by Warren S. Archibald is included. Although original contributions are solicited, some of the best numbers are reprints of important articles or convenient digests of more formidable monographs. The reprints include the two valuable essays by Professor Andrews on *Connecticut and the British Government* (pp. 35) and on *The Connecticut Intestacy Law* (pp. 28); and two related articles by Lawrence H. Gipson included under the title *Connecticut Taxation, 1750–1775* (pp. 41). From his own recent book Jarvis M. Morse has adapted his brief political sketch, *Under the Constitution of 1818: The First Decade* (pp. 20), and his longer essay, *The Rise of Liberalism in Connecticut, 1828–1850* (pp. 45). Roland M. Hooker's *Boundaries of Connecticut* (pp. 38) deals briefly with the subject of Clarence W. Bowen's detailed study, and is made more useful by a number of maps.

Another handsome map adds to the value of Isabel S. Mitchell's attractive essay on *Roads and Road-Making in Colonial Connecticut* (pp. 32). The Connecticut roads which Washington followed are similarly depicted in the map which accompanies Professor George M. Dutcher's interesting survey of *George Washington and Connecticut in War and Peace* (pp. 36). The excellence of these and other illustrations emphasizes the lack of pictures in the two architectural studies: J. Frederick Kelly's *Early Domestic Architecture of Connecticut* (pp. 30), and the Reverend Noah Porter's *The*

New England Meeting House (pp. 34). The former especially calls for plans and details. The author writes with authority, though he is in conflict with critical opinion in supposing that in New England log cabins commonly antedated frame houses. Porter's discourse is clearly obsolete in respect to architecture but it has other claims to inclusion. A lesser art, but one of interest to many readers, is represented in Mabel R. Moore's brief study of Lambert Hitchcock and his *Hitchcock Chairs* (pp. 12, illustrated).

The longest pamphlet (a triple number) is devoted to *The Settlement of the Connecticut Towns* (pp. 75), a seminar paper by Dorothy Deming, rewritten by Professor Andrews, and illustrated by Moses Park's map of 1766. This important subject of settlement is further developed, locally, in Miss Deming's *Settlement of Litchfield County* (pp. 16), and in Professor Leonard W. Labaree's *Milford, Connecticut* (pp. 30).

The University of Michigan. VERNER W. CRANE.

The Records of the Virginia Company of London. Edited by SUSAN MYRA KINGSBURY, A.M., Ph.D., Carola Woerishoffer Professor of Social Economy, Bryn Mawr College. Volume III. [The Library of Congress.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1933. Pp. xx, 769. $5.00.)

THE first two volumes of Dr. Kingsbury's *Records of the Virginia Company*, published by the Library of Congress in 1906, comprised the company's official court minutes from 1619 to 1624. The editor included also a list of the other extant records with a promise of publication at a later date of such as were not already reproduced in reliable and convenient sources. The appearance of this, the first of two volumes designed to complete the set, is a welcome event. For here is a record not merely of the Virginia Company, but of early English colonization as well, that will prove of interest to all students of this period in American and British history.

Though the present volume covers the years from 1607 to 1622, only fifty-seven items are of earlier date than April, 1619. Several of these, however, are of more than ordinary interest. Especially is this true of the instructions from the Virginia council to Sir Thomas Gates in 1609 and those of approximately the same date to Lord De La Warr. When considered with the commissions and instructions to Governor Yeardley and Sir Francis Wyatt, found in the later pages of the volume, the student is provided with a valuable key to the course of the company's policy. Of interest too, especially to those disposed to emphasize the economic motivation of the adventurers, are the records of several suits in chancery through 1612 and 1613 by which the company sought an enforced collection of unpaid subscriptions to the joint-stock.

The remainder of the 273 documents fall within the period between Sir

Edwin Sandys's accession to power in the spring of 1619 and the late months of 1622. These are in many ways the most interesting and controversial years of the company's history. Sandys's heroic efforts to rescue the business from bankruptcy and to realize the original aims of the colony constitute an enlightening chapter in the history of English expansion. A careful study of the years prior to 1623 will also reveal the reasons for his failure and for the eventual dissolution of the company. The court book is, of course, the most valuable single source for a study of these problems. It suffers, however, from the disadvantages of all official minutes, which in this instance are somewhat aggravated because of bitter factionalism among the adventurers. To get a clear and correct view of the company's affairs, it is necessary to check impressions gained from the minutes against the evidence of documents in which the adventurers, both at home and in Virginia, spoke more frankly and with less regard for the reputation of the business. Miss Kingsbury has assembled here for the convenience of other students the materials necessary for such a study.

These she classifies as official and private. Among the former are important documents of state which do not appear in such official publications as the *Acts of the Privy Council*. More valuable, however, are the papers included from the so-called Manuscript Records of the Virginia Company, Volume III. This important collection, consisting of original records or authenticated contemporary copies dating from August, 1621, to the end of the company, was acquired by the Library of Congress from Thomas Jefferson. Especially useful are the official acts of the councils in London and in Virginia, and the official correspondence between the officers of the company and the authorities in the colony. No other source that we have reveals more clearly the purposes of the Sandys party, or the difficulties which were faced in the attempt to realize his hopes for the colony.

The private papers of some of the more prominent adventurers are of even greater value for certain purposes. The most important single collection represented in this volume is the Ferrar Papers belonging to Magdalene College at Cambridge. A few documents of official or semiofficial character are included, but more interesting is the private correspondence of Sandys and his loyal lieutenants, John and Nicholas Ferrar. Communications between them regarding the affairs of the company, and letters of complaint from leading colonists, reveal conditions in Virginia quite different from the impressions conveyed by the official reports spread upon the minutes of the court. While it will be difficult to impugn the sincerity and honesty of the company's officers, their opponents' charges of mismanagement and of overhasty and ill-judged action are well supported by these papers. The Manchester Papers, which record the interests and activities of the powerful Earl of Warwick, Sandys's most determined enemy at the

time of the company's fall, relate chiefly to events of 1623 and after. Such items as fall prior to that date, however, are included. Of other collections, notice may be taken only of the Smyth of Nibley Papers, now held by the New York Public Library. Among the more significant developments in the colony was the establishment by special patent from the company of private plantations financed by individual groups of adventurers. These records of Smyth's Hundred constitute the only sizable collection of papers relating to one of these enterprises. Since they, like many items in the Ferrar and Manchester papers, are frequently difficult to decipher, scholars are indebted to the editor for the convenience with which they may now be consulted.

It has been possible to mention only the more important collections included in whole or in part by Miss Kingsbury. A list of the libraries and depositories from which she has collected her material indicates the extent and value of her labors. She has gathered together and arranged in convenient chronological order sources for Virginia's history that heretofore could be consulted only at great expense of time and money. Many of them have been known and used before, but not a few represent her own discoveries. The Government Printing Office has produced an unusually attractive volume, and its careful and scholarly editing guarantees its permanent usefulness to students. When the set is completed with the publication of the fourth volume, it will be difficult to think of any work which may more justly be referred to as a monumental service to American scholarship.

New York University. W. F. Craven.

The Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources, 1745–1799. Edited by John C. Fitzpatrick, under the direction of the United States George Washington Bicentennial Commission. Volumes I.-IX. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1931–1933.)

The first considerable publication of Washington's writings was the twelve-volume edition of Jared Sparks, brought out just one hundred years ago (1834–1837), of which the first volume was a life of Washington, Volumes II. to XI. mainly letters, while Volume XII. included speeches, messages, proclamations, and addresses during his presidency, together with some forty miscellaneous letters, 1759–1798, agricultural papers, etc. For half a century this collection of Washington's writings was the chief source of knowledge about him and inevitably gave tone to the common conception of his life and character. Of the editorial deficiencies of Sparks, aptly characterized by Dr. Fitzpatrick as an "editorial hypnosis", it is perhaps sufficient here to say that the liberties he took with his texts were for the

most part such as editors of that period regarded as not only their privilege but their duty. The code of realistic historians which prescribes anathema for the editor who presumptuously alters the text of a historical document is of comparatively recent enactment.

The recognition of Sparks's shortcomings, as well as the need for an enlarged and sounder basis from which to judge the commander of the Revolutionary armies and the first President, led to the publication of a new edition, under the efficient editorship of Mr. Worthington C. Ford (1889–1893). Mr. Ford, while doing full justice to the zeal and indefatigable labors of Sparks in the cause of Revolutionary history, points out that a consequence of his editorial practices was "a distorted idea of Washington's personal character and abilities". "The young colonel of the Virginia regiment, serving in the colonial wars", remarks Mr. Ford, "writes in Mr. Sparks' volumes with the same maturity of style and thought as the president of the established republic." Mr. Ford accordingly had a twofold aim: first, to bring the published letters into conformity with the originals, making it possible to comprehend "the gradual mental development of the man from youth to old age"; and, secondly, to make the selections such as would "preserve a proper balance between the public and the private acts of the man, so displaying his character more fully than has been done". Nevertheless the limitations of Mr. Ford's collection were such that he found his greatest difficulty to be the task of choosing from amongst the abundant riches that lay before him.

To make a brief comparison of these two editions, Sparks printed somewhat more than 2500 letters and documents; Ford eliminated more than one-third of these and included many new ones (his additions, leaving out of consideration the numerous extracts, were about 200 fewer than his eliminations), drawing more largely than did Sparks on journals and diaries. The result is that Sparks and Ford together published more than 3200 letters and other items. Dr. Fitzpatrick estimates that the total number of letters and documents written or signed by Washington are between eight and ten thousand. This estimate may be gauged by the number included in the first nine volumes of the new edition, ending with November 3, 1777. To use round numbers, there are 2850 letters and some 800 other items. For the same period Sparks has about 735 items in all, Ford 870. Moreover, the letters are rapidly increasing in number. For instance, in the period June to December, 1775, there are 205; for the year 1776 the number rose to 708, and in the first ten months of 1777 to 1163. It is these two collections, then, presenting not more than a third of Washington's writings, that for nearly half a century have constituted the fund upon which the layman and the historian alike have for the most part drawn for utterances of George Washington. If meanwhile an occasional biographer has made good

use of the manuscript material in the Library of Congress, others have browsed over those papers with results not always satisfactory, while still others appear to have breezed through them, bringing away chiefly treasured mares' nests.

The fundamental purpose of the Bicentennial Commission in getting out this new edition of Washington's writings, as stated by the editor, has been "to develop a clearer understanding, realization, and knowledge of George Washington by making available *all* of his essential writings, unhampered by the commercial limitations necessarily existent in all private enterprises". One further statement of the editor is appropriate here: "Few established facts of history", he remarks, "will be greatly disturbed by this comprehensive publication, but the new information as to Washington's personality, found in these hitherto unpublished letters, and bringing those formerly published into exact textual accord with the originals, discloses how far afield biographers of Washington have wandered."

With regard to the all-inclusiveness of this edition, there appear to have been, in the earlier volumes, but inconsiderable eliminations. In later volumes however the occasional presentation of a letter only by way of a brief abstract in a footnote suggests that the commission may have found it necessary to contract its lines. The problem of carrying out the commission's ambitious plan is much simplified by the fact that the Library of Congress is supposed to possess in one form or another, ninety-eight per cent of the known writings of Washington, but the scattered two per cent has been diligently sought and much of it obtained. Amongst the new inclusions Washington's general orders, etc., bulk large in the whole, yet new letters exceed them in quantity manyfold. While the letters in Sparks and Ford are representative and, upon the whole, present the best that came from Washington's mind and pen, nevertheless at almost every point they leave gaps unspanned. To illustrate from two important phases of Washington's career as commander in chief, namely, his relations with Congress, on the one hand, and with the states collectively and individually, on the other, neither of these phases can be adequately comprehended without reference to many letters that do not appear in either Sparks or Ford. A like observation is true of the military correspondence.

A few specific instances of the character and extent of the new material made available by this edition may appropriately be cited. The earliest bit of Washingtoniana to survive is his school exercises, belonging to the year 1745. The earliest letter (not found in either Sparks or Ford) is one of May 5, 1749, to his brother Lawrence. There are half a dozen other additions for the period prior to 1754. Washington's life for the five years beginning with 1754, the period of his colonial military service, has seemed to be fairly well documented, with 165 letters in Ford (not to mention journals and

other memoranda) and 124 in Sparks; but the new edition increases this record to 459 letters and more than eighty orders, instructions, etc., the latter being selective only. These new materials contribute not a little to rounding out this interesting and important period of Washington's career.

The years from 1759 to 1774 are lean years in the Washington records. Sparks prints only thirty-three letters and other items of the period, Ford eighty, and, although the present edition contains 313 items (nine-tenths of them letters), the record is still relatively meager, for the yearly average over these fifteen years is less than one-fourth what it is for the preceding five years. Such as it is however the record is of exceptional value for the insight which it affords into Washington's management of his estate. These years no doubt did much for the development of the methodical habits and administrative capacity that were to be so serviceable to him in the conduct of the war.

Many illustrations might be given of the enlargement of scope which the new materials afford, but perhaps one further example will suffice. In that period centering about the battle of Trenton, say from December 22, 1776, to January 1, 1777, there are thirty-three letters and two general orders, the majority of them pertaining to the Trenton affair. Of these Sparks has eight and Ford five. Significantly, the letter of December 23 to Colonel Joseph Reed or Colonel John Cadwalader, printed by both Sparks and Ford, is omitted as lacking authenticity. The draft of the letter is not found among the Washington Papers, and the original has never been produced. Furthermore, Dr. Fitzpatrick, adding his contribution to an old controversy, contends, with reason, that Reed had no such share in the Trenton plan as that letter would seem to indicate.

The existence of variant texts of many of Washington's letters naturally gives rise to a question of proper editorial practice. In some instances letters exist in as many as five different forms—the draft, the letter-book copy, the letter sent, official copies transmitted by the secretary of Congress, and finally the Varick transcript—often varying slightly in phraseology or even in some part of the contents. The drafts, which were drawn either by Washington or one of his secretaries, usually contain emendations, frequently in Washington's own hand, of which the editor must take cognizance. The principle adopted is thus stated by Dr. Fitzpatrick: "Preference has been given, first, to the text of the letter as sent, wherever that text has been available; second, to the draft in Washington's writing or to the draft corrected by him; and, third, to the contemporary letter-book record, as the most exact duplicate of the letter sent." Significant variations between texts, particularly Washington's own emendation in the drafts, are noted. Letters written by Washington himself are designated by means of an asterisk, and the locations of the texts used are indicated by convenient symbols.

The treatment of one group of letters calls for particular mention. About 1784 or 1785 Washington edited, so to speak, some of his earlier letters, preserved in letter books, materially altering their phraseology. The letters as amended were then copied into letter books (sometimes with still further emendations), and it was these latter copies that Sparks used. Mr. Ford discovered the originals while his work was going through the press, but too late to make much use of them. Dr. Fitzpatrick has reproduced, as far as possible, the original texts, although in places the erasures are so complete as to defy decipherment.

In the performance of his editorial tasks Dr. Fitzpatrick has, naturally, availed himself of the prior labors of Sparks and Ford, but his own annotations go much further. Persons and places are identified, obscurities and allusions are clarified, and now and then the editor permits himself a discussion of facts and evidences. Each volume has its index, prepared by Mr. David M. Matteson, whose name is a sufficient guarantee of the excellence of the product.

The present reviewer definitely foregoes the privilege (a privilege highly prized by reviewers as a class) of setting down a list of errata. He solemnly avers however that he has found some errors, mainly typographical, but they are for the most part such as will scarcely mislead the wayfaring reader or greatly disturb the hardboiled historian.

Lastly, be it said, that of the multitudinous commemorations of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington this definitive edition of Washington's writings is bound to be of the greatest and most permanent value.

Division of Historical Research, EDMUND C. BURNETT.
Carnegie Institution of Washington.

History of the State of New York. Edited by ALEXANDER C. FLICK, State Historian. Volume III., *Whig and Tory;* volume IV., *The New State.* [New York State Historical Association.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1933. Pp. xii, 387; xiv, 387. $5.00 each.)

THESE two volumes maintain in every way the high standard set by the first two. The first half of Volume III. completes the story of the founding of the colony; and as might be expected these five chapters are devoted to summaries of the broader social aspects of New York colonial life. It may be doubted if students will find anywhere a more instructive chapter on the courts and the law in the colonial period than that of Julius Goebel, jr. Augustus H. Shearer's chapter on The Church, the School, and the Press is necessarily detailed but it is an admirable and painstaking contribution. Evarts B. Greene deals with a noble theme, New York and the Old Empire, and the results are such as might be expected from a practiced hand. Well-

conceived chapters by Richard E. Day, summarizing the English period, and by Edward Porter Alexander, on the Provincial Aristocracy and the Land, complete this part of the work. The captious critic might complain of repetitions in these chapters but the repetitions are defensible and they strengthen rather than weaken the effect of the narrative as a whole.

The second half of Volume III. launches New York upon the broad current of the Revolution. Here the reader finds a larger number of specialists in American history and, without disparaging the younger scholars, it must be admitted that experience does count. Ralph V. Harlow offers a discriminating chapter on the Causes of the Revolution; E. C. Burnett writes on New York in the Continental Congress in the way in which he is entitled to write in view of his knowledge of the subject. A. C. Flick discusses the Loyalists in a manner that comes dangerously near to suggesting that a thirty page chapter by a person who knows is sometimes better than an entire book on the same subject. Other chapters are the Rise of the Revolutionary Committee System by Hugh M. Flick, and the Provincial Congress and the Declaration of Independence by A. C. Flick. New York may not have been the largest, the richest, or the most populous of the colonies but the reader is likely to concede that it is one of the most illustrative as to the course of events from 1763 to 1783.

Lack of space forbids extensive comment upon Volume IV. As stated in the foreword the volume "is devoted to a further elucidation of the New York phase of the War of Independence". Topics discussed are: Military Organizations and Activities, by Peter Nelson; The Occupation of New York City by the British, by Oscar T. Barck, jr.; New York in the Strategy of the Revolution, by Hoffman Nickerson; Finance and Army Supplies, by John A. Krout; The State Government under the First Constitution, by E. Wilder Spaulding; The Clinton-Sullivan Campaign of 1779, by A. C. Flick; Peace Negotiations, 1775–1783, and The Evacuation of New York in 1783, both by Alexander J. Wall; The Mothers of New York, by Mrs. Alton B. Parker; and The Results of the Revolution, by Frank Monaghan. Notwithstanding all that has been written on New York in the Revolution one may still find here one of the best accounts of the Revolution in this pivotal area. The chapters are well organized, clear, and convincing. It is eminently appropriate, if fault must be found with any, to find it with the chapter by the editor, Alexander C. Flick, on the Sullivan-Clinton Campaign of 1779. This chapter assumes to do more than the contributors generally do toward setting the record right. Mr. Flick's old and new interpretations of the Sullivan expedition are not entirely clear or convincing. To be specific, if Washington saw by 1779, as Mr. Flick suggests, that the war was practically deadlocked and became concerned regarding the possibility that the young nation might be shut up in a narrow strip of land

along the Atlantic, these thoughts could hardly have been useful in promoting the George Rogers Clark expedition in 1778 or in planning the Sullivan expedition in the winter of 1778–1779.

Dramatic and interesting as this part of the history of the State of New York is again shown to be, the reader may look forward with interest and confidence to the succeeding volumes dealing with New York in the Union.

Cornell University. J. P. Bretz.

Honest John Adams. By Gilbert Chinard. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1933. Pp. xii, 359. $3.75.)

Professor Chinard has retold the life of John Adams simply and effectively, resisting the temptation of giving too much emphasis to his deeds or of overcoloring his personal qualities and deficiencies. He adds little to our knowledge of the man and rests almost wholly on printed material. From the Jefferson manuscripts, which he knows so well, he draws extracts from unpublished letters of Adams and he gives examples of marginal notes made by Adams in his readings. Apart from such items he has built up his well constructed story from material already available. His book must therefore be judged by the interpretation of Adams's actions and policies.

Having treated Jefferson as the "Apostle of Americanism" Professor Chinard can find only the word "Honest" with which to characterize Adams. A question, however, suggests itself; whether Adams had not a more complete vision of what would have been nearer to a model republic? His democracy was of the town meeting kind, as Chinard states. His distrust of the masses and leaning to the intelligent and responsible offered a more restricted but safer political growth than has occurred. Hamilton is held largely responsible for what has happened; yet without universal suffrage it would have been more difficult to have imposed upon us the rule of the often ignorant majority or the manipulation of that majority by the interested seeking privilege. Hamilton and Jefferson have worked together and the Adamses, father and son, have opposed their general policies, seeking to preserve the full worth of the suffrage and the great resources of the country against the attacks of mere numbers and legalized favoritism. Professor Chinard places the two, Adams and Jefferson, on the same plane of importance, which is just to both, and he also draws contrasts that are equally just. He gives an inviting account of their long and true friendship and sympathy. Yet in politics Jefferson was more "practical" and Adams more "philosophical". "Curiously enough, it was the epicurean and materialistic philosopher of Monticello who had become the heir of the messianic or providential tradition of the Pilgrims. It was Jefferson who maintained that the Americans were a chosen people, set apart to demonstrate to the world by their example that it was possible to establish on

this earth an entirely new order of things—a new form of government, a new political gospel offering hope and consolation to the oppressed peoples of the world". Adams is classed among the humanists and historians of the Old World, one who "felt that man was shackled by historical fatalities and natural limitations from which he could never liberate himself". Many such quotations could be made, challenging consideration and at times opposition; but the book as a whole leaves a distinctly favorable impression and the writer has in his wish to be just passed over a number of debatable matters in favor of his subject. Adams has so suffered in his life and in history from violent and unreasoning attack, that it is a pleasure to read so balanced a judgment as is here given. The man stands out in due relation to men and events of his times, worthy of all praise for his conscientious devotion to his country.

Professor Chinard notes that in Adams's Diary is found the earliest mention of Rousseau in any American author. I would add that the Cunningham Letters were republished in 1823 at the instance of William H. Crawford acting through Jonathan Russell—an echo of the peace treaty negotions of 1814 to be used in defeating John Quincy Adams in 1824.

Paris. WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, 1848–1868. Edited with Introduction by LEO FRANCIS STOCK, Ph.D., LL.D. [American Catholic Historical Association. Documents, I.] (Washington: Catholic University Press. 1933. Pp. xxxix, 456. $5.00.)

THE diplomatic correspondence between the Department of State and the American ministers in Rome during the twenty years of existence of the Roman legation, though of secondary importance in the diplomatic history of America, merited indeed to be made accessible to students and scholars. It remains a source of some value for the history of the events and policies of the last period of the Temporal Power, even if it adds little to our knowledge of them from other sources. Above all, it supplies definite evidence of the faithfulness with which the American government adhered to the principle of noninterference in religious questions and scrupulously avoided mingling in matters concerning the organization of the Catholic Church in America and its ecclesiastical relations to the Holy See. The temptation to use the influence of the Department of State and of its ministers in Rome in behalf especially of episcopal candidates, must have been very strong among politicians. But there is no trace in the correspondence that the department ever yielded to such pressure. In only one case Seward went as far as to send to the minister in Rome, Rufus King, a copy of a letter addressed to the department by two priests "relative to the appointment of Rev. Dr. Dunne as bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Dubuque, Iowa", and

of adding to the letter the following short noncommittal note: "If you can informally favor this, you are at liberty to do so" (Mar. 15, 1866, p. 357).

The few incidents of some importance in which the American minister in Rome had to ask from the papal government redress and reparations have been already described and analyzed, some by the same editor of the present volume in various articles published by the *Catholic Historical Review*, and others by the late Mr. H. Nelson Gay in articles published by various Italian periodicals. The ministers were not usually kept too busy by office work, but each one of them, especially Lewis Cass, jr. (1849–1858) and Rufus King (1862–1868), felt in duty bound to pay rather frequent visits to the papal secretary, Cardinal Antonelli, for a "chat" which provided them with a reason for making a report to the Department of State. Unfortunately the documents in the papal archives concerning the American legation are not yet accessible and as Mr. Stock informs us: "the complete story of the diplomacy between the two governments cannot be known until the materials showing the other side of the negotiations are made available" (p. vi). In justice to the American ministers it must be said that they kept the Department of State well informed of all the political rumors current in Rome and that often they made judicious remarks about the general situation in the Papal States. All of them expressed their conviction that the Temporal Power could not last unless it was supported by foreign intervention and that it would be swept away as soon as Napoleon should withdraw the French army from Rome.

The end of the legation in 1868, caused by the refusal of Congress to make an appropriation for it under the false pretext that Protestant worship in the American Chapel had been forbidden inside the walls of Rome, was well characterized by the last minister, Rufus King, as an ungenerous act toward the pope "in the hour of his waning fortunes" (p. 422). The historian, however, cannot fail to remark that as the legation was established in 1848 at a moment when American public opinion was favorably stirred by the "liberal policy" of Pius IX., so it was abolished without any resentment on the part of the same public opinion, in 1868, after the events had shown, and the Syllabus of Pius IX. had confirmed the fact that the Vatican could never compromise with political liberalism.

Mr. Stock's editing in so far as the documents in English are concerned is unimpeachable and the notes appended to them are often very valuable. But unfortunately the editing of the few documents written in Italian is very defective and shows a painful lack of familiarity with the Italian language either on the part of the person who transcribed them for the present edition, or on the part of the American legation in Rome, if not the texts but copies of them made in the same legation were sent to the Department of State. In this case, however, it seems that the editor ought to have suggested

the necessary corrections, either within brackets or in the notes, especially in the matter of geographical names often so strangely twisted as to be almost unintelligible. The bibliographical references given in the notes seem to have been chosen at random, rather than by a careful selection from the vast literature of the Italian *Risorgimento:* more valuable are the references to American history. We regret, however, that Dr. Stock has not even mentioned—with the exception of Stillman's autobiography—the large collection of letters, diaries, journals, and books of American travelers in Italy during that period. From 1850 to 1870 over twenty such books were published in the United States and several others related to that period appeared later. Many of them contain valuable material concerning the activities of the American ministers in Rome and describe problems and situations with which they were confronted and which do not appear in their official correspondence with the Department of State.

One last remark may be made concerning the propriety of calling this collection of documents "a chapter of American Catholic History" (preface, p. v). Why *"American Catholic* History"? The government represented by the legation was not Catholic; of the ministers who held the post not one was a Catholic; all religious and ecclesiastical matters were strictly banned from their field of activity; and finally in their instructions the point was always emphasized that the diplomatic relations of the United States were with the pope as temporal ruler and not as head of the Catholic Church. The American Catholic Church, as far as is known, had never anything to do either directly or indirectly with the Roman legation. Is it then not enough to say a *"chapter of American diplomatic history"*?

Harvard University. GEORGE LA PIANA.

John Hay: from Poetry to Politics. By TYLER DENNETT, Professor of International Relations, Princeton University, formerly Historical Adviser of the Department of State. [American Political Leaders, edited by Allan Nevins.] (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 1933. Pp. xi, 476. $5.00.)

THE most unfortunate mistake in the career of John Hay may have been his decision to continue as Secretary of State after the assassination of President McKinley. He was not in good health. He was growing old and his nerves had been shattered by the tragic death of his son. John Hay became, as Dr. Dennett points out, "too willing to please" the gusty, too energetic Theodore Roosevelt, his new chief. So his reputation suffered. He was blamed, on the whole unjustly, for the melodrama of Panama. He closed his eyes, in so far as the public knew, to Roosevelt's high-handed actions in the Alaska boundary dispute with England.

It was an unfortunate mistake because it detracted from Hay's repu-

tation and denied him his true place in history. Roosevelt, himself, was partly at fault. He made disparaging remarks in private. He told Cabot Lodge that Hay had been merely "a fine figure head" and it is easy to believe that these opinions circulated widely in Washington. Indeed, they appear in the histories of the era; particularly in those numerable histories written to prove that Theodore Roosevelt was the greatest of Presidents. No small part of the value of Dr. Dennett's volume lies in the fact that he refutes these aspersions. It is hard to believe that any future biographer will add greatly to the picture of John Hay which Dr. Dennett gives. The sources have been thoroughly mastered. The Hay correspondence was available. To sound scholarship has been added grace of writing. Dr. Dennett would admit, no doubt, that his portrait is that of the "counsel for the defense". But it is a true portrait. Hay's defects are admitted.

To students absorbed with the years from 1890 or thereabouts to 1915 this life of Hay is of particular interest. Dr. Dennett offers no very startling discoveries. But he provides confirmation for a number of doctrines which have been tentatively offered during recent years. McKinley, for instance, is starting—although slowly—to emerge from obscurity. To McKinley, Dr. Dennett believes, Hay owed "his position in history" (p. 177). Hay saw McKinley as far more than another Ohio opportunist who chanced to reach the White House. He was, said Hay, "distinguished by a great moral earnestness". He was a man who strove for peace.

The first important thing McKinley did, with respect to Hay, was to send him to England as our ambassador. At no time since the Civil War, perhaps since 1812, had opinion in the United States been so hostile to Great Britain. The popular thing was to call for the annexation of Canada and to denounce John Bull. Hay, however, liked the English and enjoyed the respect of the British nation. No wonder; "I prefer", he had written long before, "men who can read, for my friends". He was a man of letters. His charm, as great a charm as that of any man in American public life, was hidden by the austerity which shyness causes. Hay denied that he was an Anglophile. Terms do not matter. The point is, says Dr. Dennett, that "aside from those Secretaries of State who happened to hold office during the liquidation of the wars of Independence and of 1812, he secured from England greater concessions to American advantage than any of his predecessors in office" (p. 212).

The figure of McKinley, like that of President Cleveland to a far greater degree, grows larger as the era in which he lived is subjected to closer analysis. The portrait of Theodore Roosevelt, alas, becomes less heroic. Dr. Dennett reduces its size somewhat. A time may come, after all the letters have been read and all the sources digested, when the achievement of Roosevelt will be attributed to the conservative members of his

cabinet. Elihu Root was one of these. Hay was another. "Probably Roosevelt", Dr. Dennett remarks, "would have been shocked to discover how little foreign policy he himself created" (p. 349). What he did was to follow the course charted by McKinley, Root, "and chiefly Hay". Thus it was in the Far East, with regard to Alaska, with respect to the Monroe Doctrine.

In so far as he departed from the course, Roosevelt became involved in difficulties. This reviewer has suggested that John Hay made a mistake in continuing, after three years under McKinley, to serve as Secretary of State under Roosevelt. It may have been a mistake as far as Hay's own reputation was concerned, but it cannot be doubted that he did well for his country. Roosevelt was always anxious for a fight, with Great Britain and then in Panama. Hay, although doubtless "too willing", was an influence on the side of sense and decorum. He did not succeed entirely, but he did a great deal. And behind his conceptions of world policy lay what Dr. Dennett calls "McKinleyism"; a belief that international peace depended upon amicable relations among Germany, Great Britain, and the United States.

This is more than a history; it is a charming biography. Dr. Dennett was happy in his choice of a subject. What biographer could ask more? Here was a man who was secretary to Abraham Lincoln and Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt. He moved through the Civil War, through the turbulent years of Reconstruction, through the decades when the United States decided, once and for all, that it was an industrial and not an agricultural nation. He watched the varied pageant and was part of much of it. He was a man of varied talents, so varied that it is to be wondered that he accomplished as much as he did. Even Dr. Dennett is puzzled by that.

"John Hay", he writes in an early chapter, "escapes all classifications except that of amateur". But why classify? In a later chapter the author points out that Hay found himself, although against his will, at the age of sixty: "There he gathered up all his fragments of experience from a varied and wavering life and brought them into play to high purpose."

New York. HENRY F. PRINGLE.

The Public Papers of Francis G. Newlands. Edited by ARTHUR B. DARLING, Associate Professor of History in Yale University. Two volumes. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1932. Pp. xi, 434; xi, 426. $10.00.)

SENATOR Newlands of Nevada was an upright, shrewd, and exceptionally hardworking legislator, of whom the *Nation* once said that he was just the type for whom the founders of the republic planned the Senate. He

overcame the handicap of his comparatively insignificant state to such an extent that in his later years no Senator's words carried greater weight. He was not a brilliant man; he scorned the ordinary processes of politics; he was often derided for the repetitiousness of his speeches, which he excused on the ground that only constant iteration could get an idea into some of his colleagues' heads. But when he took up an important question he went to the bottom of it by days and nights of intense study, till his committee reports and formal speeches came to be looked for as unusually exhaustive and even authoritative. Some of his stands—his championship of silver in the nineties, his desire to invite Cuba to a place in the Union, his opposition to Wilson on the Panama Tolls question, his highly individual views on the Federal Reserve Bill—were much criticized. But even his opponents admitted that he saw questions of the day in their broad relations.

Considered strictly as a reference work, these two large volumes constitute as excellent an exposition of the public labors, the ideas and arguments, of Senator Newlands from his election to Congress in 1892 till his death in 1917, as one could wish. They must be called a reference work, for they are hardly more readable than the *Congressional Record* itself. They contain almost no biographical data, for the private papers have been reserved by the family. They contain no critical appraisal of Senator Newlands's work, no detailed research on the political background, no narrative of his political or parliamentary battles. All this has rightly been reserved for the future biographer of the man. The book lets Senator Newlands speak for himself, with only such comment as explains why and how each speech came to be made or each report to be written. The arrangement is topical and not chronological, though a progressive order is maintained; and it is thoroughly logical throughout. What is more, the speeches and other materials have been well knit together, while by deletions the author has suppressed the repetitions so characteristic of his subject's work.

These papers contain little that is brilliantly original, much that is useful—in this being a faithful reflection of Senator Newlands's mind. His two specialties were irrigation and reclamation, with which may be bracketed water power and transportation. Upon these topics in particular the volumes will always remain a useful work of reference. They present a mass of data upon arid lands, waterways, flood prevention, hydroelectric power, irrigation, timber culture, mineral laws, grazing laws, harbors, railways, the Adamson Act, and so on; some of it coming from sources difficult to reach—for example, careful statements which Senator Newlands prepared for the press, or addresses to general meetings. Among the minor topics treated are tariffs, trusts, imperialism, and labor. Beyond the shrewd conservatism natural to him (a conservatism which led him to accept silver but reject other Populist doctrines), Senator Newlands had no definite political philosophy; he

judged public questions *ad hoc,* rather than by the application of an elaborate set of preconceptions. But he was never superficial; he always labored upon his subject till he wrested from it a definite and valuable set of results. This is why his public papers are better worth preserving than those of many a showier leader, and why Mr. Darling's carefully wrought compilation may be called valuable.

Columbia University. ALLAN NEVINS.

Our Times: the United States, 1900–1925. By MARK SULLIVAN. Volume V., *Over Here, 1914–1918.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933. Pp. xxiii, 676. $3.75.)

MR. Sullivan's latest volume lacks subjects which possess the novelty and interest of the early portions of volumes I. and II. It contains twenty-seven chapters, all of which are related to events and tendencies on this side of the Atlantic during the World War. There are 297 illustrations, including the chief political figures of the time, actors, authors, soldiers, battleships, the Johnson-Willard fight, cartoons, street scenes, reproductions of newspaper headlines (and the famous German Embassy notice printed at the time of the sailing of the *Lusitania*), factory workers, posters, war gardens, the *Lusitania* medal, and a few war scenes abroad. His search for "atrocity" pictures apparently met the same failure that has met others (pp. 78–82).

In accounts of Mr. Sullivan's earlier volumes, this reviewer has not adequately emphasized the variety and value of the illustrations which appear in *Our Times.* These run into many hundreds, and constitute source material of real importance. They entailed, obviously, an extended search and intelligent selection.

The most unusual chapters in the volume are those on the personality, purposes, and methods of George Creel and the Committee on Public Information. These were written with a degree of sympathetic understanding which has probably not been too common in previous estimates of Creel's work. One would guess, even if he did not previously know, that they were written by a newspaper man, and by one who knew Creel personally and who had carefully appraised the qualities of the man (chs. XXI., XXII.).

There are other points of interest, even though they are of less importance or novelty. Following a precedent set in earlier volumes, Mr. Sullivan has recorded some of the additions to the popular vocabulary which resulted from the War (pp. 63–65). He has drawn an informing picture of the practice and abuse of propaganda (pp. 67, 71, 72, 188). He has given a brief but thought-provoking account of the tragedy of atrocity stories (p. 78). There are some illuminating sentences about the understanding of Wilson which the common people achieved (p. 230), and which Roosevelt did not (p. 279). Conscientious objectors are dealt with (pp. 359 ff.), and

some space, perhaps too much, devoted to Grover Cleveland Bergdall (p. 353). The regulation of social life during the War might well have received more attention (p. 464). So, also, might the important and interesting reduction in the numbers of sizes and styles of various manufactured articles, and their standardization (pp. 383–384).

Most interesting of all might have been an expanded account of the growth of war feeling or "hysteria" (pp. 467–469). The present generation of college students was born just before or during the war, and no question about the conflict is more difficult to answer convincingly than the oft-repeated "Why did the people of the United States get so excited about the war between Germany and the rest of the world?"

This reviewer disagrees with Mr. Sullivan's judgments less frequently than he expected to, in consideration of the many recent and controversial questions involved. I think, however, that Roosevelt's attitude toward Wilson had less "grandeur" than is indicated on page 206. Did Wilson have "a distaste for talking with men" (p. 223), or did he have a distaste for meeting and talking with endless streams of men who could contribute nothing to the task at hand and who would merely absorb his time and energy? On page 278 the impression is given that Cleveland was alive in 1912.

Dartmouth College. CHARLES R. LINGLEY.

Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918. Supplement 1 and 2, *The World War.* Three volumes. *Russia.* Three volumes. [Publications of the Department of State.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. First—1933. Pp. lxxxviii, 914; lxxvi, 917–1835; lxxix, 862. $1.50 each. Second—1931; 1932. Pp. lxx, 754; lxxxi, 887; lxii, 330. $1.75; $1.50; $1.00.)

THESE six volumes conclude the series of Foreign Relations Supplements relating to the World War. They cover not merely the year 1918 up to the conclusion of the armistice, but in the case of Russia and various smaller topics the entire period of American participation in the war. The general principles of compilation followed in the earlier volumes of the series have been maintained. Supplement 1 contains the section devoted, as in the preceding supplement of 1917, to the general conduct of the war and to the discussions of the bases of peace, terminating in the diplomatic aspects of the conclusion of the armistice. It is the largest section of the volume and among the most important of the whole series. It includes documents relating to the formulation of war aims; voluminous reports of private conversations relating to possible openings for peace, notably the Herron-Lammasch discussions and the correspondence exchanged by President Wilson and the Emperor Charles through the mediation of the King of Spain; extended European comment upon the development of American policy and

Wilson's war-aims speeches; reports by Mr. Frazier of the discussions in the Supreme War Council. The section concludes with the documents relating to the German appeal for an armistice, Allied opinion as to the desirability of an armistice, and the telegrams of Colonel House describing the conferences at Paris and Versailles that led to the pre-armistice agreement and the armistice itself. The remainder of the first volume of this supplement is largely devoted to the problems arising from American coöperation with the Allies in shipping, maritime transport, the production and distribution of food, raw materials, and oil. It concludes with a section covering the problems of the Far East and Latin America so far as they related to the war. The second volume of this supplement is concerned especially with war-trade problems. It contains the papers setting forth the attitude of the United States regarding contraband, prizes, the laws of visit and search, blacklisting of neutral firms, and the measures affecting neutral trade through the control of imports, exports, and bunker coal. The bulk of the volume is devoted to the negotiations with the northern neutrals concerning exports and shipping, those with the Netherlands regarding the taking over of the Dutch ships, and trade agreements with Switzerland and Spain. Supplement 2 contains miscellaneous topics running through the whole war period from April, 1917, to the armistice, omitted from the 1917 supplement: prisoners of war, enemy aliens, treatment of enemy property, trading with the enemy, relief operations, military service conventions.

The three special volumes on Russia are justified by the quantity and interest of the papers relating to the revolutionary period. They are of the first importance not merely for the student of diplomacy but as a record of the progress of the Russian revolution seen through American eyes. Volume I. covers political affairs and diplomatic relations. It begins with the March Revolution, follows the career and fall of the Provisional Government, and deals in some detail with the establishment of Soviet power, the negotiations of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the diplomatic relations of the Soviet Republic in the spring and summer of 1918, the attitude of the United States toward the terror and its efforts to secure international action to stop it. Volume II., entitled *Disintegration and Intervention,* is devoted to papers dealing with the regional movements of opposition to the Soviet régime in Siberia and Manchuria, Murmansk and Archangel, the Caucasus, the Ukraine, Bessarabia, Finland and the Baltic countries, the military action of the Allied and American governments, and the nature of their coöperation with local groups. Volume III., entitled *Economic Relations,* deals chiefly with loans to the Provisional Government, efforts to stabilize Russian currency, relief problems, assistance in railway transportation, and Soviet repudiation of loans.

From the foregoing it is obvious that the range of the documents in this collection is comprehensive and their number legion. They form the essen-

tial stuff of the material which the student of American diplomacy in the war period will use, and they are invaluable to the general historian of the war. It is difficult to think of a topic of importance to which allusion is not made. A critical and appreciative review of the fresh information added to our knowledge of the various aspects of American participation in the war would in itself run to an essay of considerable length. How far existing historical opinion tested by this mass of detailed evidence will remain unaltered, is doubtful. The numerous papers setting forth the attitude of the United States government regarding neutral rights during the period of American participation raises serious question as to the fairness of the often repeated generalization that from the day we declared war our government threw into the waste basket all the principles it had as a neutral maintained regarding the rights of small states. Pressure from the War Trade Board and other emergency agencies of control was constantly exerted in the direction of making the blockade of Germany more effective. But it is clear that the State Department exercised great caution in approving measures that touched the trade of the smaller neutrals and was keenly alive to the desirability of protecting traditional principles from infringement by a belligerent, even in the case of our own belligerency. The extensive reports of the peace conversations carried on in the spring of 1918 will be of great value for the detailed study of this phase of war diplomacy. They do not, however, materially affect the conclusion that, even admitting the willingness of the Emperor Charles to make wide concessions, a negotiated peace with Austria-Hungary was impossible. The emperor would have been glad to develop the negotiations so as to lead to a general peace; he was not prepared to separate Austria-Hungary from her more powerful ally; the Entente Alliance, even had Germany been willing, would not consider any general peace until German armies were defeated. The materials dealing with the deliberations of the Supreme War Council at the time of the armistice do not add materially to what has been revealed by the published papers of Colonel House. Respect for the sensibilities of the Allied governments has resulted in omission of some interesting passages in the House-Wilson correspondence. Mr. Frazier's letters offer a fair substitute for the official *procès-verbaux* of the Supreme War Council meetings which the French and British did not wish printed. They confirm the conclusion that the Allies were extremely worried by Wilson's conduct of the early stages of the armistice negotiations. The President not merely wrote his notes to Germany without taking the advice of the Allied leaders, but gave them no advance information as to the diplomatic steps he planned to take. They waited anxiously in Paris, as much in the dark as to the nature of his reply to the German appeals for an armistice as any newspaper correspondent.

Yale University. CHARLES SEYMOUR.

SHORTER NOTICES

Corinth: Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume VIII., part I., *Greek Inscriptions, 1896–1927.* Edited by Benjamin Dean Meritt. [The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.] (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1931, pp. 180, $5.00.) The record of Mr. Meritt as an epigraphist is such that the mere fact that a collection of inscriptions is edited by him is a guarantee that the work has been done competently. There are features that one might wish to change. Thus it seems a pity that all inscriptions of which a sufficient part has been preserved are not accompanied by translations. Nor would the editor himself expect every reader to agree with all emendations suggested. It probably is best, however, to omit such technicalities and pass to a discussion of the contents. The first impression is one of disappointment that a center so important has yielded so little. Naturally not much has been preserved from the pre-Roman period, and even for the Roman period the harvest is meager. It is true that the volume contains 331 entries, but this high number is deceptive. The proportion of intact inscriptions or even of relatively long fragments is small, and the proportion of isolated fragments showing merely a few lines is large. Even so the contributions are by no means negligible. There are, in the first place, a few precious fragments of decrees of classical Corinth. For the Roman period there is useful material for the study of games and festivals and of the careers and history of prominent individuals and families. A special interest attaches to those documents in which the titles of Roman municipal magistrates appear in Greek translation. The seven letters of No. 111 are enough to prove the existence of a Jewish synagogue at Corinth though many may be sorry to learn that "the style of lettering indicates that the inscription is considerably later than the time of St. Paul".

The University of Chicago. JAKOB A. O. LARSEN.

Paleolithic Man and the Nile Valley in Nubia and Upper Egypt: a Study of the Region during Pliocene and Pleistocene Times. By K. S. Sandford and W. J. Arkell. [Oriental Institute Publications, volume XVII.] (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. xvii, 92, 21 figures, 43 plates, $6.00.) Sandford and Arkell have spent four seasons on the Survey of Egypt, beginning in 1926–1927. The present volume has to do with the 560 kilometers of the river embraced in the programs of the first and fourth (1929–1930) seasons, namely from Semnah to Luxor. The survey of the Lower Nile begins at Semnah, a point 1600 kilometers from the Mediterranean and some 96 south of the Sudan frontier. Semnah was the southern outpost of Egypt during the Middle Kingdom.

The authors have made an exhaustive study of the Pliocene and Pleisto-

cene formations. Not a single human artifact was found *in situ* in the Pliocene deposits. The valley terraces dating from the Pleistocene have yielded an abundance of industrial remains *in situ:* (1) Chellean implements in the terrace 30 meters above the Nile flood plain; (2) Acheulian industry in the 15 meter terrace; (3) Mousterian industry in the 9 and also in the 3 meter terrace. The cultural and physiographic changes both point to unlimited time.

The Sebilian industries of the region take the place of what, in Europe, would be called Upper Paleolithic and Mesolithic, Lower and Middle Sebilian corresponding to Upper Paleolithic and Upper Sebilian to Mesolithic. No art objects and no pottery have been found in Sebilian sites. The absence of pottery and the presence of the extinct species *Bos primigenius* and *Bubalus* give an indication of the length of time that elapsed between Upper Sebilian and the earliest of the pre-dynastic periods. One chapter is devoted to Rock Pictures and one to Human Industries. The entire work is fully and beautifully illustrated and the text is accompanied by numerous references to the literature.

Yale University. GEORGE GRANT MACCURDY.

Greek Mercenary Soldiers, from the Earliest Times to the Battle of Ipsus. By H. W. Parke, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. vii, 243, $3.75.) In this small volume, by a remarkable economy of space, the entire field of Greek mercenary service is treated with full detail and with abundant documentation of authorities ancient and modern. It enhances the reader's pleasure to discover that the author—unlike the ordinary writer of monographs on some phenomenon of Greek public or private life—is possessed of a fine and discriminating historical sense. Indeed, his work might profitably be described as an investigation of the details of the long series of military episodes wherein the Greek mercenary is involved. We are grateful too that Mr. Parke refrains from padding his text where information is scanty. Little is known of the wandering free-lance of the age of the melic poets; he is dismissed with a notice of less than four pages. Throughout, the author frankly cuts his coat according to the cloth available.

The information is meager concerning the nature and extent of the mercenary service under the early tyrants and even under the free city-states. But the details of the organization of the 10,000 "Cyreans", their tactical error at Cunaxa, their *modus operandi* in the difficult retreat, and their final dissolution owing to the defects of the system under which they operated—all this forms a picturesque as well as instructive interlude between the conditions of mercenary service in the Peloponnesian War, so far as we know them, and those that prevailed under Philip of Macedon, by whose time,

as Mr. Parke notes, "the mercenary had become a typical feature of Greek warfare". Our knowledge of the profession of arms is fairly abundant for the concluding half of the fourth century.

One could wish that the brief concluding chapter which reviews the general circumstances of mercenary service had been materially enlarged. As it is, the author confines his observations to the economic antecedents of xenic employment. The tribulations of the small landed proprietor lay behind it, though contributing elements are found in expatriation, love for adventure, and a general instability and uncertainty of political conditions. Attainment to wealth was not an immediate objective, as the normal rate of wage was pitifully small. But usually the expectation of plunder lay in the offing. The establishment of the Hellenistic kingdoms rid Greece and the Near East of the peril of at least the roving captain of mercenaries. Thus the service was shorn of its most romantic, if dangerous, features.

One can have no hesitation in describing *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* as a model piece of research, sound, scholarly, and conservative.

The University of Virginia. A. D. FRASER.

A History of Delos. By W. A. Laidlaw, M. A. (T. C. D.), Lecturer in Latin in the University of St. Andrews. (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1933, pp. 308, 18*s*.) This attractive volume is devoted to a theme full of human interest —a barren island, three miles long and 1420 yards broad, raised by religion, geography, and Rome to a place of vital importance for gods, empires, and traders. It rests on the definitive publication by the French of the results of their long continued excavations. The enterprise, for which the excavators, notably Roussel, furnished assistance, is not badly timed. Of the *Exploration archéologique de Délos* parts I.-XII. have now appeared; and of the separate publication of the inscriptions (*Inscriptiones Graecae,* XI. and its post-war sequel, *Inscriptions de Délos*) the four volumes covering the period of Delian independence (314–166 B. C.) were issued before the regretted death of Durrbach in 1932. What precedes and follows is still lacking; and it may be argued that it would have been wise for Mr. Laidlaw to await Roussel's (let us hope) imminent edition of the lapidary records for the greatest commercial epoch in the history of the island—that following its reoccupation and colonization by the Athenians in 166 B. C.—before sending his work to the press. It is true that this defect in his documentation is made good in large measure by preliminary publication of inscriptions in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* and by Roussel's admirable monographs, *Les cultes égyptiens à Délos* and *Délos, colonie athénienne;* but much new light will undoubtedly be thrown on dark places by the reëditing and reordering of the documents in this portion of the Delian *Corpus*.

Mr. Laidlaw is well versed in the specialized literature of his subject. He

has missed *Classical Review*, 1901, pp. 38 ff. on the Sandwich Marble, Kirchner's note on *I. G.* ², II.–III., 2336 (*cf.* Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles*, p. 147, n. 1), Wilamowitz's treatment of the Athenion-Aristion incident (*Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad.*, 1923, pp. 39 ff.). His attitude on the many problems raised and discussed by earlier scholars is ordinarily that of a reporter. He commonly returns a Scotch verdict on the evidence, which he always states fairly. He seldom raises new problems, and hence adds little to the specialists' knowledge of the subject. As a work of summarizing, his book is reliable, and because of its detail, comprehensiveness, and actuality it fills a need for the general student of Greek history and sets a starting point for future investigators.

Harvard University. W. S. Ferguson.

Tapestry, the Mirror of Civilization. By Phyllis Ackerman. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xi, 451, 48 plates, $4.75.) The preface of Miss Ackerman's book states its aim to be "an attempt to make tapestries living objects of aesthetic perception by revealing them as part of life . . . records of the habits, amusements, follies and illuminations of the human spirit". She has presented a panorama of European history from a new angle.

The first chapters deal with the tapestries of the ancient and early medieval world: those of Egypt, Minoan-Crete, Greece, and the pagan and Christian Roman empires. Tapestry as a loom technique is assured an ancient lineage both from documentary evidence and extant examples; but it is impossible to say definitely whether the ancient Mediterranean civilizations ever produced tapestries which could be considered such in the full connotation of the term—that is in the application of this weaving technique to large scale pictorial decoration.

The main part of the book is occupied with the history and development of the great tapestries of Europe. The author traces this from the establishment of the great looms of Paris and Arras of the fourteenth century, through the fully developed Gothic of the fifteenth century, the Renaissance tapestries of the sixteenth century revolutionized by the touch of Raphael, the Baroque of the seventeenth century under the dominating influence of Rubens, and the eighteenth century with its pictorial and classical types. A valuable addition to this history is a chapter on the less well known looms of Italy, Spain, Germany, Sweden, Holland, and England.

The silk and metallic thread tapestries of the Far East—the *k'ssu* of China and the *tsuzure* of Japan have hitherto received scant attention in histories on tapestry. Miss Ackerman has made a distinct contribution by devoting a chapter to these products of the Far and Middle East. A chapter on the tapestries of Peru is also a valuable addition. Many books on the arts of Peru

have appeared within the last few decades; but the histories of tapestry have made no note of this interesting product of the Western World.

Three appendixes on the technique and æsthetic of tapestry, guild regulations, and some collectors and collections, copious notes and a brief bibliography complete the text of the book. The forty-eight page illustrations are good and well selected, but it is to be regretted that more of the tapestries mentioned could not have appeared in illustration.

Miss Ackerman brings to her task both scholarly and æsthetic appreciation of her material and a wide knowledge of her subject. Her vivid style gives life to the successive historical epochs, to the great patrons by whose order the tapestries were woven, and to the artists and weavers who created them. The book is for the layman and amateur rather than the specialist, and is intended to serve as an introduction to a detailed and comprehensive study on the tapestry of France and Flanders of the so-called Gothic period, from about 1350 to 1520.

The Cleveland Museum of Art. GERTRUDE UNDERHILL.

Pre-Feudal England: the Jutes. By J. E. A. Jolliffe. [Oxford Historical Series.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. viii, 122, $2.50.) The author has not only made a careful examination of medieval manorial arrangements in Kent, but he has brilliantly tied some of his results into the early political and institutional history of southeastern England. The task has in no wise been small nor the result so slender as the size of the volume might suggest. Nor can the bearing of post-Conquest conditions upon Kentish institutions of a much earlier period, in the light of Mr. Jolliffe's showing, be called fanciful. He has made skillful use of Domesday Book and the Anglo-Saxon charters to forge connecting links between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the days of the Kentish kings. For the feudal period he has used a fair amount of material from unpublished documents which are not easily uncovered.

Mr. Jolliffe has already explained elsewhere his main line of approach. The lathe is shown to be a basic, continuous institution both in agrarian and in constitutional history. Its standing in the administrative and judicial system of Kent, even long after the Norman Conquest, dwarfs the hundred and shows the position of the latter to be superficial. There can be no doubt that here the old administrative unit centered in the king's *tun* was the lathe, as Chadwick and others have held. It was an early subdivision of the Kentish kingdom, corresponding to the shire elsewhere. The hundred, as the writer suggests in the appendix of the work, was apparently imposed under West Saxon rule. Areas consisting of a hundred hides could not have formed the framework of the Kentish hundreds.

The writer throws welcome light on the usages of gavelkind and the peculiar liberties of Kentishmen which caused the peasantry in the feudal

period to be classed as freemen. Thus he disposes of what Maitland called a difficult passage in the social and economic history of England. The concluding chapters of the work present conclusions which are useful although very difficult to prove. The author postulates an origin for the rapes of Sussex similar to that of the lathes and finds in land systems indication that Jutish rule once extended as far west as the Hampshire Avon. The West Saxons are left no alternative except that set forth by Mr. Leeds, an advance to the westward up the Thames. In the concluding chapter is assembled legal and archæological evidence tending to show that the so-called Jutes came from the Rhenish region held by the Ripuarian Franks.

The University of California. W. A. Morris.

Medieval Europe. By Sydney MacGillvary Brown, Professor of European History, Lehigh University. (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1932, pp. xii, 544, $3.50.) Textbooks continue to pour forth from the presses with bewildering rapidity and no doubt will until college teachers rebel, an event which we pray is not far off. Mediocrity and sometimes even failure duly to credit those whose writings have been pillaged to make up the compilations are deadening characteristics of some of these books. Dr. Brown's volume, however, is exceptional. It is delightfully written. There is a charm about his presentation of the matter that is captivating. Teachers should, consequently, find the book a valuable aid in making clear to underclassmen the conditions and movements of an age difficult to understand because so different from ours. He is at pains, too, to make clear his debt to others, admitting with Lessing that he "should be poor, cold, short-sighted indeed, if he had not to some extent learnt humbly to borrow foreign treasure, to warm himself at others' fires and to reinforce his vision by the glasses of art". Some quarrels, however, we have with Dr. Brown. We miss with regret matter about the institutions, life, and ways of the early Germans, the Northmen, the Arabians before Mahomet. Emphasis occasionally obscures what is intended to be stressed; thus, a page and a half is devoted to the highly dramatic formula for major excommunication, much less to penance a mighty factor in the work of the medieval Church in taming barbarous peoples and in bringing into their lives some sense of higher ideals and moral living. The verses about penances that are not to be given wives for fear their husbands might become suspicious are questionable fare for undergraduate imaginations, however wise the advice which they contain (p. 354). Hroswitha, finally, was not the sister of Bruno of Cologne (p. 147).

The Pennsylvania State College. F. J. Tschan.

Die Anfänge der abendländischen Völkergemeinschaft. Von Gustav Schnürer. [Geschichte der führenden Völker, herausgegeben von Heinrich Finke, Hermann Junker, Gustav Schnürer, Band 11.] (Freiburg im Breisgau,

St. Louis, B. Herder Book Company, 1932, pp. ix, 319, $2.75.) Dr. Schnürer's work covers the period from the advent of the West Goths in the Roman Empire to the end of the Carolingian dynasty in the ninth century. In scope it approximates Louis Halphen's *Les barbares* and Christopher Dawson's *The Making of Europe*. It is intended, together with Dr. Finke's projected volume, *Die geistige Kultur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance,* to provide an adequate introduction for thirteen additional volumes dealing with the history of the national states of Western Europe.

This work, however, carries with it a vigorous intellectual thesis. The author wishes to change the theme of this period from that of the decline of Rome to that of the rise of the Occident. The Romans, dying intellectually, were too much absorbed by their own senility to notice the positive structure that was arising at their back door. Throughout this period new people were molding a community of culture that was something more than the Roman heritage.

As the Roman veneer was rubbed away the characteristics of the residual peoples come to light. The East with its Græco-Oriental background moved easily to the establishment of a bureaucratic court system that soon ossified. The West, lacking a definite heritage, groped its way more slowly. The hatred of restraint, so manifest in the exaggerated decentralization attained in political feudalism, was a constant danger. The West, however, was not lacking in unifying elements. Its peoples were related by ties of blood and of necessity must act together in repelling invaders from the north and east. Above all was the common spiritual bond provided by the Church. Decadent Merovingian Christianity was revived by missionaries from the north. This native Christianity, working in from Ireland and from the Continent, had ripened in England. The Carolingians accepted it and the papacy, at odds with the East, cast its lot with the new peoples beyond the Alps.

A delicate balance arose with the division of worldly and spiritual powers between church and state. The Occident opposed the attempts of either to control both functions; it wanted neither a theocracy nor an emperor-pope. Though the scales tilted from one side to the other, the balance was never destroyed. The West moved definitely forward, meeting successfully the challenge of Islam. The struggle of the peoples about the Pyrenees was symbolic of the new strength of the West. The Arabs had rejected Rome, the Occident had not. There was never a clean break between Rome and the West. Christianity, preserving the best of Rome, also gave to the new nations an inner superiority that aided them in establishing a community of culture (*Kulturgemeinschaft*).

Princeton University. J. E. Pomfret.

The Jewish Foundation of Islam. By Charles Cutler Torrey, Professor of Semitic Languages, Yale University. [The Hilda Stroock Lectures at the Jewish Institute of Religion.] (New York, Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1933, pp. vii, 164, $1.50.) The five lectures published in this short volume were delivered in March, 1931. Much of the technical material in Lectures II. (The Genesis of the New Faith) and III. (Allah and Islam in Ancient History) was not presented to the popular audience for whom the lectures were planned. The author has very skillfully included his references in his narrative. Three useful indexes are provided: one for names and subjects, one for Arabic names and words discussed, and one for passages cited from the Koran and from the Scriptures.

Jewish influences in Arabia long antedated the age of the Prophet. The author believes that even as early as the sixth century B. C. Mecca may have had a Jewish colony. The presence of Jewish settlements in Yemen in south Arabia is also of importance, for trade and commerce between the northern caravan routes and these Jews of the south passed through Mecca and Medina.

Mohammed grew up in a commercial, city environment. The influences of such an environment on him are reflected time and time again in the pages of the Koran. The Prophet was not an illiterate epileptic proclaiming the word of God. He was a thoughtful, original, energetic man who had learned much from association with Jewish scholars. Mohammed could read and write, and it is probable that he wrote the Koran with his own hand. The extensive, though incomplete knowledge of Jewish lore which he displays in the Koran, Mohammed obtained from his Jewish friends and teachers. Professor Torrey's insistence on Mohammed's training and intellectual aptitudes is of great importance, for here is a man in many respects more understandable than is the trader who became a prophet. Though he embodied a Hebraic heritage in his teachings, Mohammed did not emphasize this as derived from book learning, the actual source for his knowledge of Jewish beliefs. He wished to establish his position as that of a continuator of an old, but changing order. The words of his book were those sent from God, not discovered in the annals of men. The Arabic Koran is "a work of genius, the great creation of a great man" and built throughout from materials familiar in Mecca long before the time of Mohammed. He had "the wisdom to see and the originality to adopt them". It is, however, the Jewish traditions that influence every part of the book.

The title of these lectures, though well chosen, does not suggest the many interesting and important points which the author discusses. Chapters I. (The Jews in Arabia) and II. (The Genesis of the New Faith) are in all probability of the greatest interest and importance for the historian. He will, nevertheless, read with pleasure and profit the excellent sections that complete the volume.

Princeton University. GRAY C. BOYCE.

Dějepisectví: Jeho vývoj oblasti vzdělanosti západní ve středověku a době nové. [Historiography: Its development in the region of western culture from the Middle Ages to recent times.] By Josef Šusta. (Prague, Historický Klub, 1933, pp. 222, 40 Kc.) This brief summary of historical writing in the Occident is based upon a series of lectures delivered by the author to the teaching candidates for normal schools. The book is confined to Occidental historiography and consequently leaves out both Scandinavian and Slavonic contributions. Byzantine, Spanish, and Arabian historians are likewise neglected. A few paragraphs are devoted to American historians: Bancroft, Winsor, Hildreth, Channing (whose name is misspelled), Woodrow Wilson, Washington Irving, Prescott, Motley, Draper, and Mahan.

There are eighteen chapters, from a brief summary of antiquity to the contemporary period; a large part of the book is devoted to the medieval Germanic chronicles and annals, and two chapters to the Italian and trans-Alpine Renaissance. The Reformation, the Ages of Erudition, Enlightenment, and Romanticism, are each given a chapter; the rest of the book is devoted to the nineteenth century. To American readers the most valuable portions are those mentioning Czech historians, such as Peter Zitavski, Neplach (*Summula chronicae tam romanae quam bohemicae*), Krabic, Rezensky (*Chronicon Husitarum*), etc. Politically it is of interest to notice that the Czech author separates his country's historians from their Slavic compatriots and includes them among Western writers.

In a manual like this the amount of space given to individual authors is of some significance. Thus a paragraph is devoted to Gibbon and a section to Voltaire. John Mosheim and Ludwig Schlözer in Germany, and Adam Smith and William Robertson in England, are placed in the Voltairean "school" of history. Marxist historiography is poorly represented, although Sombart, Weber, Troeltsch, and, strangely enough, Pareto, are mentioned in the section on "Economic Materialism". There is little discussion of the more recent sociological, anthropological, and psychological trends of thought, which makes this book conventional in content and treatment; but it remains, within its limits, an admirable and succinct summary, in no way rivaling the more comprehensive work of Fueter.

The University of California. S. K. Padover.

Documents illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by William Abel Pantin, M. A., F. S. A., F. R. Hist. S., Bishop Fraser Lecturer in History in the University of Manchester. Volume II. [Camden Third Series, volume XLVII.] (London, the Society, 1933, pp. xix, 232.) In 1336, in accordance with the constitutions of Benedict XII. for the

reform of the Black Monks, the two provincial chapters of Canterbury and York were merged into a single provincial chapter for the whole of England. The present volume contains the acts and statutes of this chapter for the period 1336 to 1540. A third volume will contain miscellaneous illustrative documents, financial documents, proxies and visitation citations, and an index.

In the volume before us are printed the acts, or minutes, in full, of the sessions of 1338, 1340, 1343, 1421 (an extraordinary meeting), 1423, and 1426. The minutes of other chapters, save for fragments, have not been found. Two sets of statutes are included in the present volume. The chapter of 1338, in accordance with papal command, appointed seven diffinitors to codify the statutes enacted by the old provinces of Canterbury and York in the period 1215 to 1336. This committee reported to the chapter of 1343 (pp. 27–62). A century later a "new and comprehensive code of statutes" was drawn up by a committee appointed by the chapter of 1444. These statutes are of particular value since they embody much of the legislation of chapters meeting between 1343 and 1444 the minutes of which are not available.

The chapters met at Northampton and a session lasted three or four days. Attendance was encouraged by subsidies and by fines. There was a bench of three presidents chosen at the preceding chapter by a committee appointed by the presidents of that chapter; indeed, all officers of the chapter were selected in this manner. The agenda included the examination of proxies, the report of the auditors followed by the imposition of a rate, the report of the visitors and the election of new ones for the next *triennium*, the reports of the priors of students at Oxford and Cambridge, and the report of the diffinitors, who codified old and formulated new legislation. Unfortunately only one report of the visitors appears in the minutes (pp. 141–146; a list of articles of inquiry is printed, pp. 83–89). The statutes of 1343 and 1444 cover the whole range of monastic legislation; their subject matter has long been familiar, in a general way, but there is much here of particular interest. In both minutes and statutes the maintenance of students of the order at Oxford and Cambridge figures as one of the most important projects of the chapter.

Boston University. W. O. Ault.

Jehanne d'Arc et ses juges. Par C^{te} A. Billard. (Paris, A. Picard, 1933, pp. 405, 45 fr.) The writer has approached the trial of Joan of Arc as a problem which stirs his fundamental convictions and beliefs as a Catholic, a soldier, and a patriot. The result is frequently interesting and sometimes moving but is not of profit to history, for the author is neither a philosopher nor a trained historian. Lacking the range and vision of the first, he cannot rise to heights of interpretation; instead, we are led to a conclusion which embroiders a passionate invocation to the patron saint of French soldiers with

references to present-day pacifist leaders and the German menace. Inadequate historical background shows too often; for example, in the suggestion that England's motive in the Hundred Years' War was the land hunger of an overcrowded people in a poor country. A footnote adds (p. 90) that England can live well only on the basis of her colonies, and at the time of this war, France was her colony! No amount of citation and use of original sources, nor the presence of keen observations and judgments often sound, if not novel, can overcome the effect of such limitations. The main interest of the work lies in its expression of a vigorous personality aroused by study of a national tragedy to produce a book which lies in the field of literature rather than of history.

Harvard University. CHARLES H. TAYLOR.

A Check List of Fifteenth Century Books in the Newberry Library and in Other Libraries of Chicago. Compiled by Pierce Butler. (Chicago, The Newberry Library, 1933, pp. xxiv, 362, $5.00.) With funds made available from the bequest of John M. Wing to establish a foundation for the history of printing, the Newberry Library acquired during the period beginning with 1920 more than 1300 incunabula in addition to a nucleus of nearly 300. This check list prepared by the first custodian of the foundation is arranged according to the chronological method of Robert Proctor and of the British Museum *Catalogue of Books printed in the 15th Century,* first by countries in the order of the introduction of printing, second by places under countries in the same order, and third by presses under places in the order of establishment. The entries are brief, but accompanied by references to full descriptions. A total of 1888 copies of 1795 titles is listed, including the incunabula in other Chicago libraries. In the *Census of Fifteenth Century Books owned in America,* compiled in 1919 by a committee of the Bibliographical Society of America, over 13,200 copies of more than 6640 titles were located. Beginning with 1920, there have been considerable accessions of fifteenth century books in American collections, and more local check lists as well as a second census would facilitate use of the material.

The Library of Congress. J. B. CHILDS.

Marsilius von Padua, Defensor Pacis. Herausgegeben von Richard Scholz. Two fascicles. [Fontes Juris Germanici Antiqui.] (Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1932; 1933, pp. lxx, lxxix, 637, 6.25 M.; 6.75 M.) On the death in 1912 of Emil Seckel, who had prepared the third volume of the *Capitularia* in the *Fontes Juris Germanici Antiqui* (*M. G. H.*), Professor Richard Scholz, of Leipzig, was asked to edit for the same series Marsiglio of Padua's *Defensor Pacis.* In 1911 he had published his important collection, *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streitschriften,* of texts from Marsiglio's time;

and in 1914 he published for students a volume of representative extracts from the *Defensor*. The War interrupted his labors, and the distinction of producing the first critical edition of the book fell to C. W. Previté-Orton, of Cambridge University, whose text was published by the Cambridge University Press in 1928.

Scholz's introduction includes, as one of its five sections, a discussion of the authorship of the *Defensor*, involving a biographical account of Marsiglio and John of Jandun in which he limits himself to what may be stated "mit Sicherheit, alles andere bleibt hypothetisch". While this account fills but five pages it must be regarded as the most authoritative now in print. The art, or editorial rigor, by which the writer avoids debatable and allusive material recalls Goethe's famous line: "In der Beschränkung zeigt sich erst der Meister."

The text is based upon first-hand study of nineteen of the twenty-seven MSS. known to him—seven more than were listed by Previté-Orton in 1928; of complete photographs of two MSS.; of photographic specimens of three; and for only two is the editor dependent upon information from other scholars. As the MSS. are scattered—Spain, Italy, Austria, Germany, Paris, London, and Oxford—one is impressed by the physical energy and the time required to collate them for a text covering 612 octavo pages. Noteworthy in the description of each MS. are the notes of reference to other MSS., instead of merely letting the variants speak for themselves at the bottom of the text. Scholz's method of presenting the text is different from that of Previté-Orton, who changed spelling to conform to [illegible] Latinity. The Scholz text is diplomatic; it preserves the spelling of the MSS., and is certainly to be preferred.

Scholz was the first to show that the MSS. fall into two classes, the 'French' and 'German'. Previté-Orton adopted this classification, and believed that erasures and changes in what seems to be the oldest text, Tortosa, in Spain, indicated that Marsiglio emended the text after going to the emperor's court. The 'French' MSS. outnumber the 'German'. With the *editio princeps* of 1522 the Germans appear to have made the *Defensor* a political textbook; at any rate all the printed editions were published in Germany, and reprints continued down to the eighteenth century.

Kenyon College. W. P. Reeves.

The British Empire-Commonwealth: a Study in Political Evolution. By Reginald George Trotter, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. *The Age of Metternich, 1814–1848.* By Arthur May, Professor of History, University of Rochester. *A History of Geographical Discovery, 1400–1800.* By James Edward Gillespie, Professor of Modern European History, The Pennsylvania State College. [Berkshire Studies in European History.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1932, 1933; pp. viii, 131; x, 126; viii, 111, $1.00 each.) In

these three volumes the high standard of the Berkshire series is maintained, and the special purpose of providing convenient reading matter for college students is met. It is unfortunate that the publishers did not include in Gillespie's *History of Geographical Discovery* a few maps and charts. Two or three zinc cuts would have added little to the cost, and much to the usefulness of the volume. The editors assume, of course, that the students will rush to a historical atlas; actually they will be content with the vaguest impressions of the location of Ormuz and Cape Bojador. In the reading matter on the first half of the nineteenth century previously available for college students there has been too much of a spotlight on Paris, too little attention to Central Europe. Professor May has done something, though not enough, to correct this chronic aberration. He has achieved in this respect a better balanced book than Georges Weill with many times the space in *L'éveil des nationalités*. In Professor Trotter's study of the British Empire-Commonwealth the editors' disclaimer that "no pretense is made that these studies are a contribution to historical literature in the scholarly sense" is out of of place. The American college student with his metered reading capacity has imposed upon the writers of his weekly assignments a rigid form no less compelling than that which the Athenian audience imposed upon Æschylus. Instead of the three unities there are the three chapters of thirty pages each. The historian and artist who fits his subject matter beautifully and completely to this form has performed for his colleagues a creative service of great value. This Professor Trotter has done.

Western Reserve University. ROBERT C. BINKLEY.

The Treasure of São Roque: a Sidelight on the Counter-Reformation. By W. Telfer, M. A., Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. [The Church Historical Society.] (London, Society for promoting Christian Knowledge; New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. ix, 222, $3.00.) A historical investigation centering about the discovery in the church of St. Roch, Lisbon, of a tin box containing sixteenth century deeds authenticating the transfer of relics of saints would seem at first thought an unprofitable exercise. Mr. Telfer proves it the contrary. The church of St. Roch holds the most notable collection of relics in the Iberian peninsula; the documents which Mr. Telfer studies relate to the most important and celebrated donation ever made to its reliquaries, that made by Don Juan de Borgia and given a public "Recebimento" of surpassing magnificence in January, 1588, just when the Great Armada was preparing in Lisbon's harbor.

The research and exposition go beyond the technical study of the documents and the biographies of those who wrote them. For the history of religious ideas there is presented not only the sharp antithesis of Calvin's *Traicté des reliques* and the Jesuit Ferrand's *Disquisitio reliquaria* in matter

of the relic cultus, but the divergence of ideas within Catholic ranks and even within the Jesuit Order. Enlightening is the comment (p. 205) on the relevant canon of the Council of Trent (1563): "the Tridentine canon is not designed to promote the examination by critical methods of the authenticity of those relics that are receiving veneration. It is entirely concerned with the regulation of the practice of piety towards relics, assumed to be authentic if they have been in receipt of veneration. . . . The eyes of the Fathers of Trent are not turned outwards, towards Protestantism, in this matter of relics. They are turned homewards, on to the internal task of the cultivation of piety." The documents reveal "a reaction of sentiment, on the Catholic side, in answer to the Reformation conceived as an attack upon religion and piety" (p. 202). To oppose Protestant novelties the Church, and especially the Jesuit fathers, rekindled the sentiment of Catholic tradition; the verity and value of church tradition was assumed, and the people concerned in these authentications had as their fundamental idea that *"piety is the thing"* (p. 209).

This excellent study of documents engages ultimately a problem of values thrown into relief by the Counter Reformation: What is the intrinsic value of piety? But to reconcile mind and heart in philosophy or religion is not Mr. Telfer's function as historian. His book illuminates the problem historically, and is an authentic study of the age.

Duke University. ERNEST W. NELSON.

Tabeller over Skibsfart og Varetransport gennem Øresund, 1497–1660. Ved Nina Ellinger Bang og Knud Korst. Anden Del, *Tabeller over Varetransporten, B.* [Udarbejdede efter de bevarede Regnskaber over Øresundstolden. Udgivne paa Carlsbergfondets Bekostning.] (Copenhagen, Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag, 1933, pp. 274.) This volume contains tables of trade through the Sound, both into and from the Baltic. The first part lists data for individual years, except years ending in 5, for the period 1562–1657. The second part covers the years ending in 5, that is, from 1565 to 1655. The home port of the ships is given and also the origin and destination of the cargo. We do not get much, if any, fresh information concerning articles of commerce. To the Baltic were sent salt, wine, textiles, stockings, pepper, lead, tin, coal, hides and leather, stone, herring, cheese, soap, live animals, and meat. From the Baltic came corn, meal, ale, tar, potash, hides and leather, wax, powder, saltpeter, copper, iron, and timber. General comments have been made as to the plan and value of this work, which is such a monument to human industry and of such service to the historian of commerce, in reviews of the earlier parts published in this *Review*, XXIX. 370; XXXVI. 860.

Harvard University. N. S. B. GRAS.

Demokratie und Diktatur in der englischen Revolution, 1640–1660. Von Georg Lenz. [Beiheft 28 der Historischen Zeitschrift.] (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, 1933, pp. 220, 7.50 M.) There have been surprisingly few attempts to give an economic interpretation of the English revolutionary period. Of late, however, scholars have begun to remedy this deficiency. I. D. Jones and Margaret James have published works on this theme in England, and now we have a German essay along similar lines. The author, who is a Hamburg civil servant, undertakes to analyze the economic structure of the contending factions and to show how this element affected the political developments of the period. Beginning with a brief survey of the century before the civil wars, he follows the course of events to the Restoration, concentrating on the political activities of the army and Cromwell's work in setting up and maintaining the Protectorate. Three economic strata are distinguished in the Puritan party, the workers, the smaller traders, and the merchant princes. These are represented by the political factions of the Levelers, the army officers, and Parliament, respectively. By their union in the period of the first civil war they succeeded in destroying the agrarian feudalism represented by the king and the lords, but after the victory they could not agree on the economic policy to be substituted. The result was a prolonged struggle in which the conservative mercantile forces succeeded in defeating, first the proletariat, and then the smaller bourgeoisie. The author suggests that this result is to be accounted for by the timidity of the Levelers in shrinking from a thoroughgoing social revolution, and by the fact that the financial gains of the army officers caused them to lose sympathy with the less important traders.

The volume suffers from an inadequate background of research and from a three-year delay in publication. The works of the Webbs make untenable the thesis that the Stuarts were largely unmindful of the interests of the lower classes. It is, of course, quite unfair to present the conclusions of the intemperate, controversial *Gangraena* as giving a true picture of the intellectual attitude of the Independents. Furthermore, Miss James's careful treatment of the period, which has appeared since the composition of this work, renders much of it already obsolete. Nevertheless the essay is stimulating in the boldness of its approach and the sweep of its generalizations. The effort to point out the political significance of such economic problems as that of the commercial monopolies is most interesting and not altogether unsuccessful. It should lead to further work along this line.

The University of Chicago. M. M. Knappen.

The Adventurers of Bermuda: a History of the Island from its Discovery until the Dissolution of the Somers Island Company in 1684. By Henry Wilkinson. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xi, 396, $4.75.) While modestly presented as the work of an amateur, this study is, in every

sense, a scholarly production, being based not only upon standard printed sources and well-known English papers such as the records of the Virginia Company but also upon exceedingly valuable, hitherto almost unexploited Spanish manuscripts of the Santo Domingan series preserved in the Archives of the Indies in Seville. The material has been skillfully integrated and the narrative progresses smoothly in flowing English, with ample footnote documentation throughout.

Discovered by the Spaniard Juan Bermudez in 1515 and formally taken possession of for Charles V. by Ferdinando Camelo in 1543, the coral group apparently remained unvisited until 1593 when one Henry May, aboard a French vessel, was wrecked and remained there for five months. In 1609, Sir George Somers, *en route* to the new colony of Virginia aboard the flagship *Sea Venture*, suffered a similar fate. Escaping after nearly a year in two boats of their own construction, Somers and his party found the Virginia settlement on the brink of starvation and hastened back to the islands for foodstuffs, which abounded there.

Under the circumstances, it was but natural that the Virginia Company should seek an extension of its charter to include them and that they should be known to contemporaries as the Somers Islands. The Spanish government protested vigorously at this invasion of its lawful territory but did little else, and, on the ground that effective occupation gives clear title, the English became undisputed masters. In 1615, a separate corporation "the Governour and Company of the City of London for the Plantacon of the Somer Island", with much the same management as the Virginia one, was granted a patent by James I. and Bermuda was divided into "tribes" (parishes), which were assigned to shareholders. Local self-government was introduced in 1620. But only a few owners took personal possession and many of the tenants sent out proved unadaptable. Not until 1684, when the company was dissolved and the tenants became freeholders, did an upward turn in the colony's affairs occur. Since then, progress has been steady, though slow.

A bibliography, a good index, divers illustrations and a superb reproduction of the famous Norwood map of 1618 add materially to the usefulness of the volume.

The George Washington University. LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ.

High Court of Admiralty Examinations (MS. Volume 53), 1637–1638. By Dorothy O. Shilton and Richard Holworthy. With an Introduction by Eric G. M. Fletcher, LL. D., B. A. (Washington, Anglo-American Records Foundation, 1932, pp. xxxi, 330, $10.00.) The Anglo-American Records Foundation is a genealogist's venture. The present volume, the second in the series, contains abridged statements of 619 examinations of witnesses conducted by the proctors in the course of proceedings before the High Court

of Admiralty at Doctors' Commons, from January, 1637, to April, 1638. The editors have made an effort to give all necessary facts and to retain the names of all individuals mentioned, but their failure to furnish information regarding the nature of the libels, the forms of procedure followed, and the decisions of the judges shows that the work is not designed for the student of admiralty law. The historian will get something out of it, for it contains occasional references to ship-ladings, prices of tobacco, costs of transportation and freight, and customs of the sea—primage and average and the practice followed by ship-captains in delivering letters to London merchants. A few details throw a fitful light on commercial connections with New England, Virginia, Newfoundland, Old Providence Island, the West Indies, and the Amazon, but the information supplied is very meager. American members of the society will find nothing here to insert in their family genealogies.

The most that can be said for the volume has been outlined by Mr. Eric G. M. Fletcher in his introduction. He calls attention to the names of a few men of prominence, none of whom are in any way connected with the colonies. He might have noted also a few others of greater interest to us over here. Samuel Fortrey was the father of the well-known mercantilist writer; Dudley Carlton was the nephew of Sir Dudley Carleton, Lord Dorchester; William Courteen was a prominent Anglo-Dutch merchant of the period; Cloberry, Delabarr, Nicholas Crispe, and Maurice Thompson were all engaged in colonial trade; Samuel Mathews, Abraham Peirce, Richard Bland, and Robert Whitmore were Virginians; Henry Taverner or Tavernor was the first Englishman to visit Carolina in 1632 and the facts here entered supplement those regarding Taverner to be found in an earlier volume of the Examinations.

What the records of the High Court of Admiralty can do for the historian of the colonies may be seen in the recent publication in the *Maryland Magazine* of all the documents relating to the case of Claiborne *v.* Cloberry *et als.* The *Virginia Magazine* might well follow so good an example and print all the documents relating to the suits, referred to in this volume, in which Joseph Saunders was a respondent.

Yale University. CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Life and Manners in Madrid, 1750–1800. By Charles E. Kany. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1932, pp. xiii, 483, $7.50.) Mr. Kany has written an entertaining and colorful book. It is copiously illustrated with delightful reproductions of contemporary artists. Madrid is presented to the reader from the outer gates in to the center of the city, with descriptions of its parks, its streets, its buildings, its great squares, and the part that each played in the city life. He next describes the palaces and the life of the court and of the nobility. After a digression on food and furniture, which does not seem

to belong there, he discusses guilds and artisans, and goes on to give charming sketches of the most colorful social types, with the clothes they wore. This is the best chapter in the work. Amusements occupy two chapters, the theater being accorded one of them. The final chapter deals with culture and religion. After the text proper Mr. Kany has added a bibliography and notes.

The most difficult feature of writing such a book is the arrangement of the material. On the whole I think that Mr. Kany has succeeded very well. I should like to have had Justice given a chapter, considering it as important as Food and Furniture. The one serious criticism of Mr. Kany that I have to make is on the choice of the sources of his material. In his introduction he divides these sources into three classes: objective facts from municipal records, laws, and decrees; subjective facts reported by travelers or given in Ramon de la Cruz's plays—the more realistic ones; illustrative examples from the more exaggerated plays of Cruz and from satirical writers. I have no quarrel with the value assigned by Mr. Kany to decrees, etc., as objective facts; I will concede that facts recorded by travelers are less accurate, but they do make up for that loss in accuracy by being more picturesque. Wherefore I regret the omission of seven books of travel from Mr. Kany's bibliography, among them Caimo and Beckford. I regret also that he made so little use of the anonymous journals, satiric in tone, yet with the reform of public ills as their avowed *raison d'être*. Mr. Kany mentions but two of the fifteen which existed for a greater or less space of time in the last half of the eighteenth century. If he includes them in class three, I feel I must protest. They are worthy of promotion to the second class.

The dramatist Cruz and Mr. Kany seem to disagree about the value of certain of the former's plays, the dramatist denying that exaggeration existed, while Mr. Kany affirms its existence. Agreeing as I do with Cruz, that the exaggeration lay in certain members of society of that day and not in the picture painted of them, it seems to me that we should be grateful to the author for having included these "picturesque and extravagant details", assigning to them however more importance than he is disposed to give them.

The University of Illinois. ARTHUR HAMILTON.

Metternich, 1773–1859: a Study of his Period and Personality. By Algernon Cecil. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. 344, $2.75.) Whatever the explanation, Metternich, after years of neglect, has recently been the subject of several studies. With disarming candor, Mr. Cecil characterizes himself as "a reviving Tory"; and one closes the book with the feeling that the revival is almost complete. Here is the Metternich that Disraeli so ardently admired; here, "the political grandfather of Mr. Baldwin".

Mr. Cecil, who had the counsel of Professor G. P. Gooch in preparing this work, has drawn upon the orthodox sources of information. Unwar-

ranted reliance has been reposed in the chancellor's retrospective memoirs. If novelty is lacking in the data upon which the author worked, there is brilliance in interpretation and sprightliness—excessively so—in literary style.

Flashing epigrams serve well in describing the byplay of the peacemakers of 1814–1815, but do not make for clarity in handling the weightier matters of the time. Metternich's course at the Congress of Vienna shatters, the author holds, the theory that he was an obscurantist politician. In his appraisal of the Carlsbad Decrees he seems to defend the Metternichian philosophy of government and administration. In general, as international prime minister in an epoch singularly noted for its tumult and disorder the chancellor so acted as to merit the applause of a discriminating posterity. A catholic biography, the treatment of the non-political aspects of Metternich's life is adequate. One must agree that Mr. Cecil has realized his ambition of writing a life of Metternich that is not "too impossibly heavy for the travelling-bag".

The University of Rochester. ARTHUR J. MAY.

La Charte constitutionnelle de l'Empire russe de l'an 1820. Par Georges Vernadsky, professeur à l'Université Yale, membre correspondant de l'Institut slave de Prague. Traduit du Russe par Serge Oldenbourg. (Paris, Recueil Sirey, 1933, pp. viii, 283, 20 fr.) Professor Vernadsky's excellent monograph is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Russian political history of the early nineteenth century. It is an almost exhaustive study of the constitutional project of Novosiltsov, which had attracted less attention on the part of the historians than the earlier project of Speranski. After an introduction which attempts to determine the place occupied by the Charter of 1820 in the general political system of Alexander I., we have a detailed analysis of the sources of the Novosiltsov project as well as a topical discussion of its contents. Novosiltsov's indebtedness to the Polish constitution of 1815, the contemporary constitution of the South German states, and the political writers of the period has been given a full and competent treatment. Of particular interest to the American readers will be the discussion of Novosiltsov's (and Alexander's) interest in the federalist experiment of the United States.

Two general contentions stand out as a result of Professor Vernadsky's investigation. The first is that one cannot accept without serious reservations the familiar division of Alexander's reign into the early "liberal" and the later "reactionary" periods. It is apparent that in 1820 and in the following years Alexander was just as much interested in projects of constitutional reform as he had been in his youth. The other conclusion one arrives at is that Alexander's attempt to formulate a constitution which would not deprive the sovereign of his freedom of action was not a peculiar product of his own

mentality, as it has been so very often represented. The same attempt to combine "liberalism" with the authoritarian principle was typical of the period and it can be found practically in every constitution then in force on the European continent. With both these contentions I find myself in full accord.

It seems to me that the author is on a less firm ground when he asserts that the realization of Novosiltsov's project was much more probable than that of Speranski's. "Sans la mort prématurée d'Alexander I[er], il est possible que la Charte Constitutionnelle serait passée du domaine des suppositions au domaine de la réalité" (p. 47). This I doubt, in spite of the fact that Professor Vernadsky's attempt to connect the Charter of 1820 with the Balashov experiment in the Riazan province seems to me quite convincing. One cannot forget that in 1823–1825 all the internal difficulties which had prevented the realization of the earlier constitutional projects were just as great as before, while Alexander's personal condition was not such as to suggest the possibility of a vigorous action on his part.

Harvard University. MICHAEL KARPOVICH.

La cour de Belgique et la cour de France de 1832 à 1850: Lettres intimes de Louise-Marie d'Orléans, première reine des Belges au roi Louis-Philippe et à la reine Marie-Amélie. Publiées par le Comte Hippolyte d'Ursel. (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1933, pp. ii, 323, 20 fr.) The letters contained in this significant volume have been taken from the family archives of the Duc de Vendôme, and Count Hippolyte d'Ursel has performed a splendid task of editing. The body of the book is composed of extracts from the personal letters of Louise Marie, first queen of the Belgians, and Monsieur d'Ursel has interposed a brief running narrative that provides a lucid and interesting continuity. The editor is to be congratulated for his skill in the selection of significant passages and for his broad and accurate acquaintance with the affairs of Europe during the first half of the past century.

One has heard much of Leopold I. as the "Uncle of all Europe", but little has been written of his wife. Apparently, Louise Marie d'Orleans was a worthy mate for the personable king of the Belgians. Endowed with an acute political sense, she shared her husband's secrets and participated in his policies. Her judgment on events was keen and intelligent, and her influence was felt throughout Western Europe during the short span of her political life. In Belgium, such power as she wielded was of a purely personal nature. She gave counsel when her husband desired it, but she never interfered in public affairs. In France, however, she worked not only to cement the alliance between the country of her adoption and her native land, but she also sought to advise her royal parent, Louis Philippe, in regard to the pressing matter of internal policy. Liberal-minded, she yet favored strong action and her

letters to her parents are replete with warnings and wise counsels. Far better than her father she perceived the insincerities of many of the statesmen of the July Monarchy. Had Louis Philippe only heeded her warnings his career in France might have been a happier one and his policies less dilatory. She distrusted the effervescent Thiers and the egotistical Guizot, and she perceived the sincerities and ability of Lamartine although he was first a poet and second a statesman.

Particularly noteworthy and valuable are the sections relative to the stormy history of Belgium between 1832 and 1840, and her comments on the situation in Europe and in France while the February and March Days were drawing near.

Aside from the importance of these letters from a political point of view, there is another significance that should not be overlooked. Louise Marie d'Orleans was of the old school of letter writers. With her, letter writing was an art. One cannot read these extracts without regretting that this phase of good literary tradition is almost extinct to-day.

Yale University. JOHN M. S. ALLISON.

Russia and Asia. By Prince A. Lobanov-Rostovsky, Assistant Professor of History in the University of California at Los Angeles. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. viii, 334, $2.50.) The author of this volume has produced a well-rounded and very readable survey of Russia's policy toward Asia as seen against a background of those forces within Russia which shaped the direction of that policy. The continuity and caution which marked it during the nineteenth century were due to the fact that, over a period of ninety years, only four czars occupied the throne, each reigning long enough to carry his plans to fruition. During the same period, the foreign policy of the country was in the hands of a remarkably small group of seasoned diplomats. With the accession of Nicholas II., however, a period of "waywardness and reckless gambling" began. From the first, personal whim, coupled with chance influences at court, shaped the policy of the new czar. The result was the Russo-Japanese War, involving a setback to Russian prestige in Asia and, subsequently, special adjustments with Japan and Great Britain.

The author's treatment of Soviet foreign policy in Asia is as dispassionate as it is illuminating. This policy has passed through three phases. The first began with the attempt to use Asia as a lever for the overthrow of European capitalism. The next phase, following the establishment of Soviet control over the whole of Russian territory and the apparent failure of the program of world revolution, was marked by an effort to regain and extend Russian zones of influence in the Far East. The final phase, beginning in 1927, is termed primarily "defensive". It involves concentration on the Five-Year

Plan while preserving past gains in Asia. Prince Lobanov suggests that the objectives of the Soviets in Asia are virtually identical with those of the czarist government, and that the recent masters of Russia have been even more successful than their predecessors in attaining these objectives.

The relatively few errors which may be noted detract hardly at all from the value of the author's conclusions. Most serious is the quotation (pp. 222–223) from the *Memoirs* of Li Hung-chang, now generally regarded as a clever forgery perpetrated by Mannix. Chinese passivity in the face of Muraviev's activities in Manchuria (p. 140) was due not to indifference, but to utter helplessness caused by the Taiping Rebellion then raging in China. Nor did this rebellion, beginning in 1850, result from the treaties of Tientsin or cause the Anglo-French occupation of Peking in 1860. Not the Treaty of Tientsin (p. 143), but the Sino-American treaty of 1844 first provided for extraterritoriality in China.

The University of Washington. ROBERT T. POLLARD.

The White Armies of Russia: a Chronicle of Counter-Revolution and Allied Intervention. By George Stewart. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xiii, 469, $4.00.) Mr. George Stewart has made a laudable attempt to describe the gigantic struggle which was ruthlessly engaged in by both Reds and Whites. Hitherto no study dealing with the broader aspects of the Russian Civil War had appeared in this country. If it were only for the attempt to fill such a lacuna, Mr. Stewart should be highly congratulated. But the study is more than that. It is a painstaking and conscientious undertaking, based largely upon Russian material, to paint on one broad canvas the picture of the part played by the White Armies in all regions of Russia during the entire period of those interminable three years. One by one the leaders appear on the stage and perform their duties. Korniloff, Kaledin, Alexeyeff, Denikin, and finally Wrangel, in the south; Yudenich in the northwest; Miller in the north; an array of local commanders; then Koltchak in Siberia. The exploits of these men, their rise and downfall, are told in a sober but vivid manner. These leaders had to struggle not only against the Red Army, but also, and sometimes mostly, against local bandits; against local nationalist leaders like Petlura in the Ukraine; against the Czechoslovaks; and last but not least against the greed and selfishness of the so-called Allies. There is no doubt that Mr. Stewart feels sympathetic toward the White Russians, even though he cannot approve their policies. But in his concluding chapter, devoted to the emigration, he makes a mistake in his title: *Vae Victis.* The years since the tragic end of the Russian Civil War amply justify another title: ***Vanquished but not subdued.***

The historical value of the study lies in the variety of materials used, although archival sources are missing (apparently this is not due to the over-

sight of the author), and some important publications such as the studies of Dobrovolsky and Sokolov on the North Russian episode of the fight have been overlooked. Some factual mistakes of minor importance creep in here and there, and a great number of misprints and misspellings of Russian names and words denote some carelessness. On the whole, however, one cannot but welcome this study and recommend it to the scholar, the student, and the general reader alike.

School of Foreign Service, LEONID I. STRAKHOVSKY.
Georgetown University.

Caravans of the Old Sahara: an Introduction to the History of the Western Sudan. By E. W. Bovill. [The International Institute of African Languages and Cultures.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. 300, $7.50.) This is an extremely valuable study of that part of the *bled es sudan* or "land of the negroes" which lies between Lake Chad and the Atlantic. Historically, the region has faced the Sahara and the Mediterranean culturally since the general introduction of the camel into North Africa about 200 A. D. The tropical rain forest and the tsetse fly checked the caravans short of the Gulf of Guinea, practically determining the northward flow of gold and slaves and almost blocking the southward spread of Mediterranean influence, including Islam. A good deal of the slave trade, but much less of the gold trade, was diverted to the sea by the Portuguese. The through caravans practically disappeared in the nineteenth century with the outlawing of slavery, the decline in the relative importance of Sudanese gold, the European conquest of the coastal rim of Africa, and in general the age of steam. Thus this story can end with the return of the explorer Barth in 1855, with the foundations of Sudanese history and the refutation of the amazing series of errors concerning Sudanese geography in his baggage. Except for some introductory chapters and casual digressions, this account begins roughly with the first Arab invasion of North Africa in the seventh century. It is confused somewhat with the camel revolution of some four centuries earlier, and with the numerically important Hilalian migration of some four centuries later; the middle and least significant event of the three being allowed to overshadow the other two.

The author never quite comes to grips with the economics of caravan traffic: hence with such problems as the volume and value of the trans-Saharan trade in gold, slaves, salt, European textiles, and Barbary horses in medieval and early modern times. Maps visible simultaneously with the text would be of great help in a discussion of so many unfamiliar place-names. To increase the inevitable confusion, directions are sometimes reversed in the text (p. 70, line 8; p. 110, line 17). The chapter on North African races is dismally inadequate. In spite of a few serious errors and more minor slips,

the book is to be strongly recommended to students of medieval and early modern history.

The University of California. M. M. KNIGHT.

The Mind of China. By Edwin D. Harvey. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1933, pp. x, 321, $3.50.) This work "aims by means of first-hand observation, research and by reference to some of the results of the work of earlier sinologists to bring something of the essential spirit of Chinese society, past and present, within reach of the reading public" (p. 8). The "first-hand observation" to which the author refers was made possible through many years of residence in Changsha as a teacher in the College of Yale-in-China. By "earlier sinologists" are meant Legge, Dennys, Giles, DeGroot, Wieger, and Doré—whose individual writings, and translations from Chinese, are well known to English readers. Apparently no use was made of more recent studies by Granet or Maspero who have written on the sociology, particularly, of ancient China. Interesting episodes drawn from personal experience, from conversation with Chinese individuals, or from the writings of the above-mentioned sinologists are brought together under the familiar categories of animism, fetishism, shamanism, magic, etc., with the implication that these categories are as applicable to the highly-integrated and sophisticated culture of China as they are to primitive tribes. We have, then, a work of orientation, valuable to the general reader, but not designed for the specialist who prefers an exhaustive study of a particular institution. Sometimes the reader is left in doubt whether a given practice is common to all China or is peculiar to Changsha where the author lived. In the citation of Chinese titles it scarcely suffices to translate the meaning—some transcription of pronunciation is necessary if one wishes to refer to it. In view of the multiplicity of the data assembled one wishes that the index had been fuller. These suggestions are not meant to invalidate the importance of the compendium. If it cannot lay claim to envisage fully "the mind of China", it is because such an achievement need not be expected from any one study, however well done.

The Library of Congress. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL.

Catálogo de los fondos americanos del Archivo de Protocolos de Sevilla. Tomo III., *Siglo XVI.* [Publicaciones del Instituto Hispano-Cubano de Historia de América.] (Madrid, Compañía Ibero-Americana de Publicaciones, 1932, pp. 539.) In the course of the last few years there has been a marked quickening of interest on the part of the Spanish people in the history of the empire which Spain once held in America. Quite properly this interest has found its best expression in Seville, which was for a long time the nerve

center of the colonial empire and which still possesses the greatest collection of colonial archives in the world. Three institutions in that city have been particularly active—the Archivo de Indias, the University of Seville, and the Instituto Hispano-Cubano de Historia de América. A kind of interlocking directory arrangement promotes efficiency and harmony among them, and the work they are doing is thoroughly sound in character, for it is scholarly, coöperative, and systematic. By the preparation of guides, calendars, and monographs they are rendering an important service both to the investigator who has work to do in Seville and to the less fortunate student who cannot enjoy that privilege.

The volume under consideration is a good example of the work that the Seville group is doing. It is the third volume of a calendar of sixteenth century notarial documents relating to America which are preserved in the Archivo de Protocolos of Seville. In his introduction to the first volume, the general editor, D. José María Ots Capdequi (who is also director of the Instituto Hispano-Cubano), leaves no doubt as to the importance of the work, first, because of the intrinsic value of the documents calendared therein, and secondly, because these documents were for various reasons virtually inaccessible to the investigator before the publication of the present work. More than five thousand documents are calendared in these three volumes, and they throw a flood of light on the social, economic, and political foundations of Spain's colonizing activity in America. Each volume is equipped with elaborate indexes and with appendixes which give the complete text of many of the more important documents. The editor and his associates are to be congratulated upon having made so substantial a contribution to the history of Spain in America. Such spade work, though invaluable, must often seem to the worker a thankless task. That it is being prosecuted with vigor by the Seville group speaks well for the present state of historical scholarship in Spain.

Cornell University. ARTHUR P. WHITAKER.

The Soul of America Yesterday and Today. By Arthur Hobson Quinn. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1932, pp. viii, 261, $3.00.) The author's foreword states that his interpretation of America is from "the point of view of a disillusioned optimist" and that he has undertaken "to paint a constructive picture of those qualities of the American soul which have become integral and permanent and, by their light, to interpret the present condition of the United States". He remains, in spite of his disillusionment, an optimist for he believes that "under our apparent love of isolation has swept a steady current of liberal thinking which will lead us finally to a new internationalism". His historical conceptions are elaborated through chapters on The Birth of the American Soul (Gifts of the Races),

The Baptism of the Soul (Independence and After), The Confirmation of the Soul (The Struggle for Union), and America Comes of Age (The Nation and the World). These are followed by a chapter on The Qualities of the American Soul, reduced to seven qualities—Democracy, Efficiency, Liberality, Provincialism, Individuality, Humor, and Vision. A final section on Retrospect and Prospect undertakes to inject a note of cheer.

Just what the author means by the Soul of America or the American Spirit, a phrase which he also uses, will puzzle and probably amuse students of history. It is a fancy current with literary gentlemen which merely confuses thought and therefore seems to thrill some readers. This book has little to offer students of history which they cannot find better presented in any one of a half dozen single volume histories of the American people. The organization is bad. Vague ideas, digressions, prejudices, and misinterpretations of facts are abundant. As a whole it reveals not the Soul or the mind of America but that of a certain university professor of American literature, in the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and thirty-two, toward the close of a lifetime of departmental isolation. When dealing at all too rare intervals with the influence of American literature on history the author is on solid ground, and contributing from the fruit of a ripe scholarship.

Western Reserve University. E. J. Benton.

The People's Choice from Washington to Harding: a Study in Democracy. By Herbert Agar. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933, pp. xxi, 337, $3.50.) *The People's Choice* has attracted wide attention. The selection of subject, the manner of its presentation, the setting forth of a distinctive point of view, above all the author's courage in advancing judgments, create a broad appeal and court a vigorous reaction. Here is *Tendenzgeschichte* of a high order, well calculated to stir the reader's prejudices and preconceptions, inherent or acquired. That democracy has failed is the author's major thesis. Six of the first seven Presidents, he holds, were great, whereas of the succeeding twenty-two, only four could measure up to exacting standards. The brilliant men of the earlier period were chosen by an oligarchy. Mediocrity characterized the democratic era begun in 1829.

But if democrats and doctrinaires find this hard medicine, a sop is offered them in the author's interpretation of the Civil War. Lincoln, he contends, would never have pursued the struggle had he foreseen the triumph of Northern industrialism and its degraded proletariat. In fact, notwithstanding his aristocratic thesis, the author reveals himself as somewhat of a Jeffersonian Democrat, in his idealization of Southern agrarianism and his detestation of the city mob. Also he takes grave liberties with history when he undertakes to say what a past character would or would not have done had conditions been other than they were. Lincoln no more than any other man can be

weighed in terms of later issues. He met the task before him. Remote results were naturally veiled.

The author's favorite President is John Quincy Adams, whom he rates along with Washington, if not a shade above him. The objects of his greatest detestation are Grant and Harding. Over Coolidge and Hoover the veil is decently drawn. To Mr. Agar, the supreme tragedy of American history has been the alienation of the public lands and their exploitation by demagogues in a conscienceless bid for votes. Preserved, as Adams dreamed, as a vast heritage for social welfare and experiment, America might have been the high antithesis of the plutocracy and mobocracy into which she has degenerated. All the sins of democracy notwithstanding, of omission and commission too, the author desires for it one more chance, for "the Marxian State . . . would be the end of the American effort".

American-born editor of *The English Review,* one expects in the author a display of literary talent. The expectation is abundantly met. Scarce a page but has its literary gem, and the reader is carried swiftly along an even current of good writing. Mr. Agar has written a significant book. He has weighed democracy and found it wanting. He has focused the attention of a numerous public upon the basic realities of government. He has dared to be brilliant without becoming silly. Sharply exposing the democratic fallacy, he has left a loophole for redemption. His work is history plus something more—well documented publicism, one might call it.

Purdue University. LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

Divided Loyalties: Americans in England during the War of Independence. By Lewis Einstein. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1933, pp. xvi, 469, $3.50.) This entertaining volume is the product of scholarly research and good literary craftsmanship. The occasional misspelling of proper names is a trivial blemish. Salted with humor and seasoned with irony, it narrates the story of the Americans in England during the Revolutionary War. The title is misleading. It suggests that the characters portrayed were inwardly torn by conflicting loyalties—by loyalty to England on the one hand and by loyalty to America on the other. This is true of some of the persons treated but is by no means true of all. A number of them felt little or no sense of divided allegiance, since their loyalty was to themselves alone, and they would have served the colonies as gladly as the mother country, could the former have offered them the rewards of money, office, or fame upon which their hearts were set.

While it is known that the British government employed many secret emissaries during the Revolution, no one has yet attempted to mass all the information relating to them into a comprehensive and coherent study. Mr. Einstein, paralleling, if not following, a trail blazed by Dr. Samuel F. Bemis

in a paper on British Secret Service and the French-American Alliance (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXIX. 474–495), has made progress toward such a study by treating the American-born spies and informers utilized by George III. in England and France. It is regrettable, however, that he did not venture further and write a complete account of the British secret service during the war. Such an account would have made a more valuable contribution to Revolutionary history than the story of the Loyalists and of the American artists in London, with which he fills many pages of his book.

That the king was brilliantly served by his corps of American spies, there can be no doubt. Few governments have employed more capable or more cunning secret agents than Dr. Edward Bancroft, Paul Wentworth, the Reverend John Vardill, and Captain Joseph Hynson. They steadily furnished information regarding the confidential dealings of the American commissioners in Paris. In 1777 they procured the entire correspondence, from March 12 to October 17, of Franklin and his colleagues with the court of Versailles. On only one occasion were their machinations a liability rather than an asset. This was when Wentworth's secret overtures for peace hastened, instead of hindering, the consummation of the Franco-American alliance. While their work was efficient, it was often ineffective because George III. was disposed to minimize the significance of reports which contained bad news, or which failed to coincide with his own theory as to the probable course of events, or which seemed to him designed by their influence upon the "stocks" to benefit the financial speculations of his secret agents. Had he attached greater weight to the information supplied by his spies, it is possible that the Thirteen Colonies might have been saved for the crown.

Wellesley College. E. E. Curtis.

International Adjudications, Ancient and Modern: History and Documents. Edited by John Bassett Moore. Modern series, volume V., *Spanish Spoliations, 1795; French Indemnity, 1803; French Indemnity, 1831.* Volume VI., *Arbitration of the Title to Islands in Passamaquoddy Bay and the Bay of Fundy: Mixed Commission under Article IV. of the Treaty between Great Britain and the United States of December 24, 1814.* [Publications of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xv, 502; xxv, 418, $2.50 each.) This fifth volume of Mr. Justice Moore's new series includes the matter previously published on these litigations and their history in his well-known *History and Digest of International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party,* but with extensive and important additional material. In the older publication the barest summary was given of the work of the commission sitting under Article XXI. of the Spanish-American treaty of 1795 (Pinckney's Treaty). Now the eminent author is able to include the complete text of the

commission's summary of its findings in each case; a number of typical cases; and recapitulations (from the Spanish archives) of the total awards and their payments. There is also a very interesting account of the author's assiduous searches for the original papers of the commission, not successful. We may wish that he had been able to find documents more adequately representing the points of law on which decisions were made, for it really seems from notes available on some of the typical cases (the *Greenway*) that the commission did not give awards for the confiscation of enemy property on neutral ships, although the treaty, for the future, stipulated the principle of free ships free goods.

There are a great many new documents illustrating the history of the proceedings of the American commission which sat in Paris to wind up the claims assumed under the convention of April 20, 1803, between the United States and France: summaries of decisions in twenty-three claims, a history of the dispute between Armstrong and Skipwith concerning the liquidation of the claims, and a tabulation of their final disposition. New material concerning the adjudication and disposition of the French spoliation claims of the Napoleonic period, paid in a lump sum under the Franco-American Convention of July 4, 1831, includes a reprint of *Notes on Some of the Questions decided by the Board of Commissioners under the Convention with France of 4th July, 1831* (Philadelphia, 1836).

Volume VI. contains the cases and replies of the United States and Great Britain respectively in the arbitration of title to the islands, which were not included in the first digest. The editor has felt it necessary to abridge these arguments "by omitting unnecessary verbiage and useless repetitions, especially of quoted matter", and "by summarizing long passages charged with similar repetitions". These voluminous—even when abridged—texts have not hitherto been available in print.

The George Washington University. SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

Le Cultivateur américain: Étude sur l'œuvre de Saint John de Crèvecœur. Par Howard C. Rice. [Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée.] (Paris, Honoré Champion, 1933, pp. 263, 42 fr.) This is an interesting critique of the character and writings of St. Jean de Crèvecœur. The first part consists of a biography of Crèvecœur and of a bibliographical study of his works. The second part is an appreciation of the importance of Crèvecœur's writings in formulating and perpetuating the conception of America then entertained in Europe.

While the biography is admittedly little more than a résumé of material found in the studies of Crèvecœur by Robert de Crèvecœur and Julia Post Mitchell, Mr. Rice refutes Miss Mitchell's hypothesis that the young French lieutenant and cartographer in the regiment from the Sarre and the author

of the *Letters from an American Farmer* were not the same person. He also uses an unpublished Crèvecœur manuscript entitled Mémoire sur la Région située à l'ouest de Montagnes d'Alléghany, arrosée par les rivières Ohio, Mississippi, Illinois, Cherokée . . . which describes the author's tour through the West in 1767. Mr. Rice's résumé of Crèvecœur's itinerary is valuable, for it was upon this trip he acquired much of the intimate knowledge of the Indians and the frontier which he later used in his essays. The bibliographical study deals with the composition of the Crèvecœur manuscripts, the publication of the *Letters,* 1782, the translation and publication of the French editions, 1784 and 1787, the publication of Crèvecœur's later work, *Voyage dans la Haute Pensylvanie,* and with the circulation and criticism of his works as evidenced by their German and Dutch translations, the publication of extracts in contemporary periodicals, reviews, and comments in the writings of contemporary travelers.

The remainder of the book is a study of the picture of America found in Crèvecœur's works and of the influence which his views exercised upon contemporary ideas and actions. By means of a scholarly analysis of Crèvecœur's pronouncements upon four of the more significant topics treated in the various editions of the *Letters,* namely, Negro slavery, the American Indian, the American Revolution, and life in America, Mr. Rice weighs the significance of Crèvecœur's writings as historical documents and substantiates his thesis that Crèvecœur's historical importance is best appreciated when he is viewed as a *vulgarisateur.* He shows that while only the *Letters* and those essays recently printed for the first time as *Sketches of Eighteenth Century America* merit attention as literature, from the point of view of the literature of history in general, the translations are also valuable because they give testimony to the tastes and interests of the eighteenth century public which not only read them, but was responsible for many of the changes made in them.

The book is well annotated and contains a table of Crèvecœur manuscripts indicating the approximate date of composition and the editions in which they were published, useful bibliographies, and an index of names.

Pittsburgh. HOPE FRANCES KANE.

The Old Province of Quebec. By Alfred Leroy Burt, Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1933, pp. xiii, 551, $5.00.) In the preparation of this book, Professor Burt set himself to study the origins of the dual nationality of Canada. The finished work, however, is a study not of popular sentiment but of the various problems which confronted the authorities of Quebec from 1760 to 1791, and of the solutions which they attempted. The author found his material in the Dominion Archives at Ottawa where he worked through vast masses of correspondence, especially that in the voluminous Haldimand collection. In con-

sequence he has produced a close study of the part in government played by Murray, Carleton, and Haldimand which supersedes the previous work on the subject. He contributes to the theory of underlying causes by emphasizing the democratic spirit, evoked by frontier conditions, which inspired the *habitants* to refuse the leadership of governor, seigneurs, and even priests in the crisis of 1774–1776. In the treatment of some single episodes, such as the problem of Germain's relations with Carleton, the question of Canadian boundaries in 1782–1783, the difficulty about the frontier posts after the peace, the conflict of agitations which preceded the Constitutional Act of 1791, Professor Burt's book now easily takes first place.

In only one respect is the study unsatisfactory; that of the motives and strength of the conservative section among the English speaking minority. Professor Burt assumes too lightly that this minority was guided chiefly by economic considerations. Apparently he found of no value a tentative effort at the problem by the reviewer in the *English Historical Review* of October, 1932. Like most Canadian writers of Anglo-Saxon descent, Professor Burt sees both virtues and defects in the members of his own race but only virtues in the *habitants* of the eighteenth century. He leaves it to be inferred from peremptory orders that the ideas of certain "new subjects" concerning sanitation differed widely from those of their British rulers; and from requirements for schools that the French-Canadians had only a moderate interest in education. The style is at times pungent, at times affected by mixed metaphors. These minor criticisms, however, detract little from the solid merit of a book which is among the most significant of recent contributions to Canadian history.

The University of Buffalo. W. B. Kerr.

Deutschland und die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika im Zeitalter Bismarcks. Von Dr. Otto Graf zu Stolberg-Wernigerode, Privatdozent für neuere Geschichte an der Universität München. (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1933, pp. ix, 368, 9 M.) The author of this study of German-American relations in the time of Bismarck is one of the few German historians who has sensed the importance of United States history for Europeans and who is trying valiantly to break down the provincialism of German universities in this respect. The present volume testifies to painstaking and thorough research in both German and American archives, and reveals noteworthy fairness, restraint, and balance in the discussion of highly complicated and controversial issues.

Part I. contains little that is not generally known to American historians, but much that will be new to German readers. Beginning inevitably with Frederick the Great and Baron von Steuben, the author discusses the contacts between the United States and the German states to the close of the

Civil War and the Franco-German War, with attention to economic and cultural, as well as political and diplomatic relationships. Considerable space is devoted to public opinion in the United States during the War of 1870–1871, and to Bismarck's great anxiety to remain on a friendly footing with the United States in order to avoid muddling the general European situation. In the formulation of the chancellor's views, the author has shown the influence of personal friends like Motley and Bancroft, and of the cultural bonds established by the heavy German immigration to the United States.

Part II. covers the period when the United States began to emerge from her isolation, and when Bismarck reluctantly launched his new colonial policy. Economic competition, the clash between two rival policies of protection, as in the controversy over the importation of American hogs to Germany and the export of German sugar to the United States, differences over most-favored-nation clauses in trade agreements, and increasing contacts because of ambitions in the West Indies, Central America, Hawaii, the Carolines, and Samoa—these are the essence of German-American relations from 1870 to the close of the century. It is interesting to point out that although Bismarck regarded the Monroe Doctrine as *eine Unverschämtheit,* he was always careful not to wound American opinion on this delicate subject.

The author has reprinted thirty-three pages of documents, mostly from American sources, and of special interest to German readers. A twenty-one page bibliography includes few American but many German publications not generally known to American scholars. Newspaper material has been used as a guide to public opinion. Some proof reading errors have crept in, especially in the English quotations, but errors of fact are surprisingly few when one realizes what handicaps a scholar working in the field of United States history encounters in a German University.

The Ohio State University. CARL WITTKE.

Pioneering for Peace: a Study of American Peace Efforts to 1848. By W. Freeman Galpin. (Syracuse, Bardeen Press, 1933, pp. ix, 237, $3.00.) Selecting a more limited chronological period for his investigation than previous historians of the peace movement in America, Professor Galpin confirms their most important conclusions. It seems even more clear that peace societies played a rôle of some importance in bringing about amicable settlements of controversies between this country and England and France; that the heated controversy over nonresistance both strengthened and weakened the movement against war; and that, while the great mass of Americans gave peace but little consideration, the peace movement would not have made such progress as it has without the work of the pioneers of the first half of the last century.

The organization of material in this book follows in general the same

pattern found in earlier studies; there is, however, less emphasis on the interrelations of European and American peace movements. Professor Galpin has explored manuscript material not previously used, and this adds considerably to our detailed knowledge of peace activities, especially in New York and Rhode Island. Miss Christina Phelps demonstrated, in her *Anglo-American Peace Movement in the Mid-Nineteenth Century,* that research in newspapers is necessary for determining the extent to which peace propaganda received a general hearing; and Professor Galpin has carried very much further the use of newspapers. It appears from his extensive and painstaking research, for which historians of pacifism will be especially grateful, that a fairly wide public was acquainted with peace propaganda and that considerable opposition to it was aroused. It would have been helpful had the political affiliations of the editors and the approximate circulation of their journals been indicated. One of the most important contributions that Professor Galpin has made is to demonstrate that for the most part peace leaders were prominent in business, church, and politics; that they were, in short, substantial and influential members of their communities.

Although students of the peace movement will thank Professor Galpin for pointing out minor errors in their work, and for providing many new details, they may regret that he has not taken a somewhat broader view of his task. In spite of several excellent studies which we possess, there is still need for one which evaluates martial and pacifist sentiment and activities in relation to our fundamental historical experiences, the coming of the immigrants, the frontier movement, slavery, and the rise of industrialism. One wishes, for example, that Professor Galpin had pointed out that the early labor movement to a considerable extent shared the antiwar views of the substantial middle-class citizens whom he has studied; that some of the labor leaders associated war with the prevalent profit-making economy, and offered acute criticisms of the middle-class peace movement. We might also gain from knowing the attitude of various social groups, including the organized friends of peace, toward the use of violence in the Dorr war, the antirent war, and the riots and mobs which were so prevalent in the thirties and forties. But within the limits which Professor Galpin set for his investigation, his study is a model of painstaking research.

Smith College. MERLE CURTI.

De Landelijke Arme Blanken in het Zuiden der Vereenigde Staten: Een Sociaal-Historische en Sociografische Studie. Door Dr. A. N. J. den Hollander. (Groningen, J. B. Wolters, 1933, pp. xiv, 517, 6.90 fl.) This book is the product of research in European and American libraries, and of two years of study and travel in the United States financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. The scope of Dr. den Hollander's subject is somewhat broader than

might be inferred from his title: as he explains (p. 58), he is dealing with poor white people rather than "poor whites". He does, however, confine himself to the rural elements of the poor white population of the South. The account is divided into two equal parts. In Part I. the author discusses the origin and history of the various classes which existed in the South prior to the Civil War. Dr. den Hollander complains that for this portion of his work he was forced to rely chiefly upon the accounts of contemporary travelers. His handling of the immense amount of this type of evidence, as well as his use of other available sources, is very satisfactory. It is not clear, however, why contemporary newspapers, and periodicals other than *DeBow's Review*, were not included among the sources.

For Part II., dealing with the rural poor whites of the post-war period, the author naturally found a much richer variety of sources. In this division he traces the complex social and economic transition which took place in the South following the war, evaluates the various factors which have given cotton so strong a hold upon the South, describes the advances made by the poorer groups, and offers some interesting suggestions as to how the economic status of the less fortunate may be improved.

Dr. den Hollander takes pains to disprove many of the traditional theories with regard to the South: that slavery was an inexpensive form of labor; that cotton requires negro labor; that long-fiber cotton can be produced only in a very limited portion of the Cotton Belt; that slavery of itself brought economic ruin to the South; that the poorer whites in many instances took over the land of former planters; that the "poor whites" are pure Anglo-Saxon, "100% American", and therefore have particularly great possibilities of rehabilitation; that the climate of the South precludes a high degree of prosperity. These few examples of the many theories attacked will suffice to show that some of the author's efforts were needless, that others challenge points of view still held by social and economic historians. In these attacks, as well as in his careful evaluation, in Part I., of the various theories regarding the origin of the "poor whites", the author by the thoroughness of his treatment and the objectivity of his point of view commands respect for his conclusions. In fact, thoroughness and balance characterize the entire study, and the monograph deserves to be regarded as an authoritative presentation, in brief compass, of a hitherto much neglected subject.

The copious notes and nineteen-page bibliography are very useful. Unfortunately the book contains no index, and no maps.

The University of Michigan. L. G. Vander Velde.

Federal Indian Relations, 1774–1788. By Walter H. Mohr (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933, pp. xi, 247, $2.50.) This book deals with that obscure phase of history, the period when the people of our embryo

country were trying to understand the significance of Indian relations and adapt themselves to it. Dr. Mohr begins his study with the condition of the Indians as they were emerging from what he designates as the collapse of imperial control, and became involved in the confusion arising from efforts to impress upon them new policies and loyalties. The beginning of the Revolutionary War brought with it the problem of determining what to do with the Indians who surrounded us. The Americans could not secure them as allies for they were easily convinced by the British that the encroachments of the colonists made these their logical enemies. And had we been able to enlist their aid the cost would have been out of all proportion to the value of their service. However, we did manage at considerable expense to keep many of them neutral—which was worth more to us. Particularly important in this period was the disastrous defeat of the Cherokee Indians that laid the groundwork for extensive territorial aggressions against the southern tribes.

After the war, efforts were made to establish peace with the Indians, many of whom had been in the pay of the enemy; but these efforts were embarrassed by the conflict of opinion as to whether the adjustment of Indian relations was a function of the states or of the general government. The considerations that determined our negotiations and treaties with them were usually mercenary and revolved around the control of their trade, acquisition of lands, and security of life and property. Altruism was little felt. In the South as in the North, land speculators were busy and treaties were made which opened the Indian country to white settlement and set in motion the territorial encroachments which did not stop until the Indians were driven west under the terms of Jackson's removal bill in 1830.

This scholarly work, the result of a prodigious amount of painstaking research, will be read with the most profit by the student possessing a background of historical knowledge of the period. The book is adequately documented, contains a good index and an extensive bibliography.

Muskogee, Oklahoma. GRANT FOREMAN.

Henry Philip Tappan, Philosopher and University President. By Charles M. Perry. (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1933, pp. viii, 475, $3.25.) Henry Philip Tappan became president of the University of Michigan in 1852. The value of his services, for the eleven years of his presidency, has been interpreted both by one of his successors, James B. Angell, and by Andrew D. White. Angell says, "With his vigorous mind he left a deep impression on the life and spirit of the University". White also says, "Dr. Tappan's work was great, indeed. He stood not only at the beginning of the institution at Ann Arbor, but really at the beginning of the other universities of the Western States, from which the country is gaining so much

at present. . . . The day will come when his statue will commemorate his services." With him as president, however, is associated one of the most lamentable of academic tragedies, and to explain it is apparently one motive of the making of the present volume. This was his summary dismissal by the board of regents in 1863. Aside from questions of temperament and of local jealousies, the causes are to be found in his attempt to introduce the methods of the German university for which the Michigan community, both academic and general, was not prepared, and in the antagonism of the sectarian colleges toward the state university. President Tappan lacked a spirit of conciliation. Gifted with a sense of humor which he occasionally used, and to good effect, he was also endowed with a strain of stubbornness. White says, "Big, hearty, frank, and generous, he easily became the prey of those who wrought upon his feelings; and, in an evil hour, he was drawn into a quarrel not his own. . . . Personally, we loved the doctor. Every one of us besought him to give up the quarrel, but in vain. He would not; he could not. It went on till the crash came. He was virtually driven from the State, retired to Europe, and never returned." A decade later, twice the board of regents invited him to be present at commencement, but he refused. His heart was still touched by bitterness at his dismissal. His grave is on the northern shore of Lake Leman, an object of reverent pilgrimage to those who loved him. This volume is a worthy interpretation.

Western Reserve University. CHARLES F. THWING.

Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831–1860. Selected and arranged by William R. Manning, Ph.D., Division of Latin American Affairs, Department of State. Volume II., *Bolivia and Brazil.* Documents 388–722. (Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1932, pp. xxvi, 544, $5.00.) This volume contains the correspondence between the United States government and its agents in Bolivia and Brazil, as well as the communications which passed between the United States and Brazilian diplomats in Washington. Since Bolivia had no legation in the United States during the period covered, and since the legation of the United States in the Bolivian capital was not established until 1848, the documents bearing on the relations of these two countries are not numerous. The bulk of the work therefore concerns the relations between the United States and Brazil.

The contents of this volume, as well as of the previous one containing the correspondence between the United States and Argentina, indicate that the present series is hardly as exhaustive as the former which dealt with the Independence period. Although it is a most useful work, the student should not overlook its frank limitations. For a detailed study of claims, of the character and technique of Latin-American governments as observed by diplomats of

the United States, of commercial matters, and of treaty negotiations of whatever nature, it will still be necessary to go directly to the archives.

The documents here published throw much light both on inter-American relations and on the relations of the American states with Europe, especially France, England, and Spain. They also inevitably suggest the importance of similar series taken not only from the archives of England and France, but from those of the Latin-American nations as well.

Duke University. J. Fred Rippy.

White Spirituals in the Southern Uplands: the Story of the Fasola Folk, their Songs, Singings, and "Buckwheat Notes". By George Pullen Jackson. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1933, pp. xv, 444, $4.50.) Dr. Jackson says it was "good fun" to uncover a "goodly batch of the aged handbooks of spiritual folk-song which seem to have completely escaped all other collectors and all other diggers into American institutions". If "good fun" means painstaking research, a great deal of travel (much of it in the back country), a scholarly presentation of his findings, and a delightful way of telling it all, then he surely had it in abundant measure. In this book a picture of a peculiarly American culture is given about which our historians know little or nothing. At least, one finds little, if any, reference to such development in any of our stories of the frontier. And it is surprising that this fundamentally democratic experience—from early New England days down to the present—should have received such scant attention. But Dr. Jackson has made up for lost time. His book has a fascination that is understandable once one has made acquaintance with it. His story of a "Sacred Harp" convention held at Mineral Wells, Texas, is but one of several that are so vivid one wants to begin singing with the "harpers". It is the tale of a wholesome, continuing interest through generations of Americans. It is a real contribution to the field of source works, and historians and others interested in the unfolding of an interesting type of rural American life will find here much to ponder over. It is well printed and abundantly illustrated, both with musical examples and reprints of photographs of people and places.

DePauw University. R. G. McCutchan.

Checagou: from Indian Wigwam to Modern City, 1673–1835. By Milo M. Quaife. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. 210, $1.00.)

As Others see Chicago: Impressions of Visitors, 1673–1933. Compiled and edited by Bessie Louise Pierce, Associate Professor of American History, with the Assistance of Joe L. Norris, University of Chicago Research Staff. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. xiii, 540, $3.00.) Dr. M. M. Quaife has condensed into a small and very readable volume his larger work on Chicago. Needless to say, the book is thorough and competent throughout.

On one or two points the present reviewer would venture to differ; to him, at least, there is a little detraction from the interest of the narrative in the long accounts of family history. He questions, also, whether the abandonment of Chicago in the eighteenth century was quite as absolute as Dr. Quaife concludes. As thorough a sifting of French sources for the eighteenth century as has been done for the seventeenth, might yield much at present unknown; for instance, on February 10, 1746, the blacksmith, Amiot, was at Chicago to mend the weapons of the Potowatamie and prepare them for the warpath. Further, the reviewer wishes that Dr. Quaife had made more out of the very interesting work of Dr. Zeuch and Mr. Knight on the Chicago portage. But these are merely matters of individual opinion.

Miss Bessie Louise Pierce's selection of visitors' accounts of Chicago begins with Father Marquette's journal and ends with Morris Markey in the year of grace 1932. The forty-nine selections are divided into four approximately equal groups: to 1848; 1848–1871; 1871–1893; 1893–1932. They are all interesting. Perhaps the one which stands out like a sore thumb is an acute case of indigestion by Rudyard Kipling mainly induced, one will gather, by the Chicago stockyards.

The University of Illinois. T. C. Pease.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

At the meeting of the Council on December 3 it was announced that Mrs. Griswold had agreed to contribute an additional $1,000 annually for the next three years in order to expedite the publication of manuscripts already accepted by the Littleton-Griswold Fund Committee.

The Council decided that the failure of the Federal government to make the usual appropriation for the publication of the annual reports of the Association would necessitate the temporary suspension of work upon the unpublished volumes of the *Writings on American History*.

At the meeting of the Council on December 28 a message of appreciation was voted to Dr. Herbert Putnam, of the Library of Congress, for adding to its important program of publication the Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States for Students and Investigators, supported financially in its preparation by the Social Science Research Council, and the authors of which are Professor Samuel Flagg Bemis and Miss Grace Gardner Griffin.

Apropos of the publication of a new and definitive edition of *The Writings of George Washington*, a message of appreciation was also sent to the Honorable Sol Bloom, chairman of the Bicentennial Commission, to Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick, the editor, and to the Public Printer.

The Council voted to convey to the Secretary of State the sense of satisfaction the members of the Association felt in the scholarly manner in which the editing of the *Foreign Relations* for the years 1914–1918 had been carried out and to express the hope that the scope of this publication would be continued on the same generous lines. The Secretary of State was also urged to promote the early publication of the Territorial Papers, the editing of which is advancing rapidly at the Department of State.

A request was also sent to the Committee on Printing of Congress, asking that a limited number of copies of the *Record* be printed on durable rag-paper, for distribution to libraries and learned institutions.

The Council voted to include the Board of Editors of *The Social Studies*, which takes the place of *The Historical Outlook*, among the committees of the Association. Albert E. McKinley remained editor, and W. G. Kimmel was appointed managing editor. To the Board were appointed Charles A. Beard, chairman, George S. Counts, Edgar Dawson, Alice N. Gibbons, A. C. Krey, Max Lerner, Bessie L. Pierce, Conyers Read, secretary *ex officio*.

The Council also voted that the Executive Secretary should express to the Carnegie Corporation the gratitude of the Association for their generous

appropriation for the Executive Secretary's office for the year past and for the coming year.

At the annual business meeting of the Association Article VII. of the constitution was amended so as to concentrate the responsibility for the investments of the Association in the hands of the Board of Trustees. This responsibility had formerly been distributed among the Council, the Treasurer, and the Board of Trustees.

The Treasurer has now completed the segregation of the various separate accounts of the Association, including those merely administered by the Association, as well as those set up from funds belonging to the Association but formally earmarked by the Council for specific purposes. It is proposed hereafter to regulate all the financial accounts of the Association upon the basis of an accounting year beginning September 1. This action has been sanctioned by the Council; and at the annual business meeting of December 28, two budgets were submitted and approved, one for the nine months from December 1, 1933, to August 31, 1934, the other for the ensuing twelve months.[1]

For the period 1932–1933, the yield on all the investments of the Association amounted to 4.26 per cent. For the year from September 1, 1934, to August 31, 1935, therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that the return will be at least 4.25 per cent. The income from unrestricted funds, plus other small items, should amount to about $5,000, which is the sum which may be allocated to the current expenses of the Association.

As the two budgets mentioned above do not differ in essentials, only the principal items of the annual budget from September 1, 1934, to August 31, 1935, will be given here.

Receipts:	
Balance on hand (estimated)	$ 3,640.00
Annual dues	11,000.00
Interest from unrestricted funds	5,000.00
Registration fees	250.00
Publications	200.00
American Historical Review:	
Contribution by the Macmillan Company	2,400.00
Share of profits, estimated	2,800.00
Expenditures, chief items:	
Council and Council Committees	$ 500.00
Annual Meeting	625.00
Pacific Coast Branch	200.00
Washington Office:	
Salaries:	
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer's Office	3,300.00

[1] The complete report of the Treasurer may be had by application at the office of the Association, 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C.

American Historical Review	6,440.00
Annual Report	500.00
Incidental	85.00
Rent, Supplies, Postage, Miscellaneous	2,240.00
Publications:	
Cost of *Review* supplied to members	7,500.00
Cost of *Review* supplied to European libraries	40.00
Payment to contributors	200.00
Binding, subscriptions	20.00
Historical Activities:	
Public Archives Commission	300.00
Writings on American History	400.00
Dues: American Council of Learned Societies, International Committee of Historical Sciences, International Yearbook of Historical Bibliography	375.00

The following are the principal items of receipts and expenditures for the year December 1, 1932, to November 30, 1933.

Receipts:	
Annual dues	$11,783.76
Endowment fund (contributions and life memberships)	189.75
Royalties	1,816.81
Interest:	
From investments, bank balances, and savings account	7,581.27
American Historical Review (from Macmillan)	5,290.35
Andrew D. White Fund (interest)	55.80
George Louis Beer Prize Fund (interest)	279.00
John H. Dunning Prize Fund (interest)	93.00
Special Grants:	
International Committee of Historical Sciences (grant from Rockefeller Memorial)	6,000.00
Bibliography of Travel (ACLS grant)	1,000.00
Writings on American History (ACLS grant):	
Toward support	650.00
Cumulative Index	500.00
Bibliography of Opinion-Forming Press of U. S. (ACLS grant)	600.00
Miscellaneous receipts	71.45
Cash on deposit	7,539.35
Expenditures:	
Washington Office:	
Salaries and temporary assistance	$ 3,317.50
Rent, light, etc.	764.89
Postage, telephone, telegraph	348.00
Stationery, printing, and supplies	410.89
American Historical Review:	
Salaries	6,155.00
Stationery, printing, and supplies	104.51
Postage	186.90
Copies supplied to members, and European libraries	7,524.47
Payments to contributors	1,162.25

Pacific Coast Branch	450.00
Council	454.87
Annual meetings, Toronto and Urbana	546.78
Annual Report	501.70
Public Archives Commission	331.25
Writings on American History	850.00
Bibliography of Travel	1,599.43
International Committee of Historical Sciences	6,000.00
Bibliography of Opinion-Forming Press of U. S.	300.00

Special Funds:

Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund:	
Expenditures on volumes, published or in process of publication	$ 1,121.38
Interest	3,936.45
Balance on December 1, 1933	13,992.34
Littleton-Griswold Fund:	
Expenditure on volume	285.39
Interest	1,162.50
Gift from Mrs. Griswold	500.00
Balance on December 1, 1933	3,067.69
Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications:	
Royalties	809.21
Expenditures on volumes	1,687.56
Balance on December 1, 1933	11,781.04
Commission on Social Studies:	
Final grant from Carnegie Corporation	68,000.00
Expenditures	67,485.93
Fund transferred to special account for editorial expenses of *The Social Studies* [1]	7,763.86
Special Royalty Account:	
Beard volume	468.85
Johnson volume	125.31
Grant from Carnegie Corporation for Executive Secretariat	12,000.00
Salaries	7,591.00
Travel	533.36
Committee meetings	729.45
Rent	770.00
Stationery, postage, etc.	739.00
Balance on December 1, 1933	1,704.38
Additional grant from Carnegie Corporation	3,500.00

The Officers and Committees of the American Historical Association for the year 1934 are:

President, William E. Dodd, University of Chicago.
First Vice President, Michael I. Rostovtzeff, Yale University.
Second Vice President, Charles H. McIlwain, Harvard University.

[1] Tentative budget for *The Social Studies:*

Editorial expenses	$3,825.00
Supplies, postage, telephone	250.00
Meetings of Board	400.00

Executive Secretary, Conyers Read, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
Secretary, Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester.
Treasurer, Constantine E. McGuire, 40 B Street, S.W., Washington, D. C.
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Patty W. Washington, 40 B Street, S.W., Washington, D. C.
Editor of the Annual Report, Lowell Joseph Ragatz, George Washington University.
Council (*ex officio*) the president, vice presidents, secretary, and treasurer; (elected members) Charles W. Ramsdell, Christopher B. Coleman, Sidney B. Fay, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, John D. Hicks, Julian P. Bretz, James F. Willard, Wallace Notestein; (former presidents) J. Franklin Jameson, Albert Bushnell Hart, Andrew C. McLaughlin, George L. Burr, Worthington C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, Edward P. Cheyney, Charles M. Andrews, Henry Osborn Taylor, James H. Breasted, James Harvey Robinson, Evarts B. Greene, Carl Becker, Herbert E. Bolton, Charles A. Beard.
Executive Committee of the Council: Charles A. Beard, New Milford, Conn., chairman; W. E. Lingelbach, Dixon Ryan Fox, Sidney B. Fay; (*ex officio*) Dexter Perkins, Constantine E. McGuire.
Board of Trustees: Conyers Read, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; Raymond N. Ball, Guy Emerson, Tracy W. McGregor, Thomas I. Parkinson.
Officers of the Pacific Coast Branch: President, William H. Ellison, Santa Barbara State College; *Vice President,* Edward McMahon, University of Washington; *Secretary-Treasurer,* Carl F. Brand, Stanford University; *Executive Committee:* (the above) and Gilbert G. Benjamin, Frederic C. Church, Harold J. Noble, James Westfall Thompson; *Editors of the Pacific Historical Review:* Donald G. Barnes, Dan E. Clark, Cardinal Goodwin, Osgood Hardy, Frederic L. Paxson, Payson J. Treat; John C. Parish, managing editor.
Committee on Program for the Forty-ninth Annual Meeting: Samuel F. Bemis, 3312 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C., chairman.
Committee on Local Arrangements for the Forty-ninth Annual Meeting: Leo F. Stock, 1017 Michigan Avenue, N.E., Washington, D. C., chairman.
Committee on Nominations: Louise Phelps Kellogg, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, chairman; James P. Baxter, 3rd, Arthur E. R. Boak, Richard A. Newhall, James G. Randall.
Board of Editors of American Historical Review: Charles Seymour, Yale University, chairman; Henry E. Bourne (*ex officio* as managing editor), 40 B Street, S.W., Washington, D. C.; Verner W. Crane, Tenney Frank, James Westfall Thompson, J. Fred Rippy, Dumas Malone.
Historical Manuscripts Commission: J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, University of North Carolina, chairman; Charles W. Ramsdell, L. W. Labaree, A. O. Craven, Edgar E. Robinson.
Public Archives Commission: A. R. Newsome, North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, chairman; Victor H. Paltsits, Margaret C. Norton, Stewart Mitchell, E. E. Dale, Julian P. Boyd.
Committee on Publications: Leo F. Stock, 1017 Michigan Avenue, N.E., Washington, D. C., chairman; the editor of the *Annual Report,* managing editor of the *Review,* and chairmen of the Historical Manu-

scripts Commission, the Public Archives Commission, and the committees on Bibliography of Travel, the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications, the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund, and the Littleton-Griswold Fund.

Committee on Membership: Arthur J. May, University of Rochester, chairman; E. C. Kirkland, J. E. Pomfret, Alan K. Manchester, F. L. Benns, Lawrence D. Steefel, Wendell H. Stephenson, Thomas A. Bailey, Reginald G. Trotter.

Conference of Historical Societies: Christopher B. Coleman, Historical Bureau, State House, Indianapolis, Ind., secretary.

Delegates in the American Council of Learned Societies: Evarts B. Greene, Edward P. Cheyney.

Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize: Tyler Dennett, Princeton University, chairman; Theodore Collier, F. L. Benns.

Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government: Samuel F. Bemis, 3312 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C., chairman; W. K. Boyd, Dumas Malone, Charles Moore, Joseph Schafer, St. George L. Sioussat, Leo F. Stock, Mark Sullivan, Charles Warren.

Representatives in the International Committee of Historical Sciences: Waldo G. Leland, Monsignor George Lacombe.

Representatives of the Subcommission of the International Committee of Historical Sciences on Colonial History: William R. Shepherd, Lowell Joseph Ragatz.

Committee on the Jusserand Medal: Carl Wittke, Ohio State University, chairman; Theodore Blegen, F. Stringfellow Barr.

Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize: Robert E. Riegel, Dartmouth College, chairman; Benjamin B. Kendrick, Fred A. Shannon.

Delegates in the Social Science Research Council: Guy Stanton Ford, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Carl Wittke; James P. Baxter, 3rd, *ad interim* member *vice* Arthur M. Schlesinger, absent in Europe.

Representatives in the Committee for the Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences: Carlton J. H. Hayes, Carl Becker, C. H. Haring.

Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications: Edward P. Cheyney, R.F.D. No. 3, Media, Pa., chairman; Henry Commager, R. D. W. Connor, Howard L. Gray, Thomas J. Wertenbaker.

Committee on the Bibliography of Travel: Solon J. Buck, Historical Building, 4338 Bigelow Boulevard, Pittsburgh, Pa.

International Subcommittee on Chronology: Monsignor George Lacombe, 1000 Fulton Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund: Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Arthur C. Cole.

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund: Evarts B. Greene, 602 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Carroll T. Bond, John Dickinson, Felix Frankfurter, Richard B. Morris, Francis S. Philbrick.

Committee on Finance: Waldo G. Leland, 907 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., chairman; Dexter Perkins, Mrs. Frank T. Griswold, Conyers Read, and the Treasurer, *ex officio.*

Committee on Radio: Conyers Read, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; John A. Krout, Roy F. Nichols, Elizabeth Y. Webb.

Committee on Americana for College Libraries: Randolph G. Adams, Clements Library, University of Michigan, chairman; Samuel F. Bemis, J. Franklin Jameson, Tracy W. McGregor, Lawrence C. Wroth, Conyers Read.

Committee on Permanent Headquarters: Dumas Malone, 602 Hill Building, 839 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., chairman; Witt Bowden, Wesley M. Gewehr, Waldo G. Leland, Mrs. Howell Moorhead.

Board of Editors of The Social Studies: Charles A. Beard, New Milford, Conn., chairman; W. G. Kimmel, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., managing editor; Albert E. McKinley, editor; George S. Counts, Edgar Dawson, Alice N. Gibbons, A. C. Krey, Max Lerner, Bessie L. Pierce; Conyers Read, secretary *ex officio.*

The final report of the Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools, which will summarize the recommendations of the Commission, is very nearly completed and will probably go to press before this notice appears. Three more of the special reports have recently appeared: *Geography in relation to the Social Sciences,* by Isaiah Bowman; *Civic Education in the United States,* by Charles E. Merriam; and *The Nature of the Social Sciences,* by Charles A. Beard.

As announced in the January number of this journal, *The Historical Outlook,* renamed *The Social Studies,* has come under the control of the American Historical Association. In the January number of *The Social Studies,* Dr. Charles A. Beard, who is chairman of the Executive Committee of the Council as well as of the new Board of Editors of *The Social Studies,* explained the reasons for the change of management and set forth the purposes of the enterprise. He laid particular stress on the fact that the Association had no desire to "monopolize" *The Social Studies* or to dominate its editorial policy. He added:

The position of the American Historical Association, then, is that of a trustee, not of an intellectual dictator, for *The Social Studies.* It has chosen a board representing various branches of social science. It proposes to widen this representation by creating a larger board of advisory editors and by asking for the active participation of the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society. Thus the American Historical Association acts as a legal trustee and provides for a fair representation of all social studies, including history, on the board responsible for the editorial policy of the magazine, and for the apportionment of space given to the several social studies.

The Council decided, as of February 27, to issue the following declaration:

The Council of the American Historical Association taking cognizance of the fact that in the contemporary world, and in the United States as well as elsewhere, there is a tendency to mobilize public opinion to secure uniform acceptance, not only of national policies, but of the theories upon which they rest;

Aware of the danger which such a situation has created and creates with

reference to the maintenance of those principles of intellectual freedom which have made possible the advancement of learning in the humanities and the development of the sciences;

Warmly reaffirms these principles as fundamental bases of the life of the teacher and scholar; and expresses its firm conviction that measures, by whomsoever taken and wherever carried out, which adversely affect the freedom of thought and expression, and freedom of teaching, are inconsistent with the ideals of scholarship and with the best interests of society.

PERSONAL

Archer Butler Hulbert died on December 24 at the age of 60. In his death the United States lost one of its best-informed historical geographers, and one who was a tireless writer and editor upon historical themes connected with the West. From the inception of his *Historic Highways of America,* until his death with his *Overland to the Pacific: a Documentary and Narrative History of the Far West* unfinished, he was at work for thirty years to reveal to the world the terrain over which the United States marched on its way to the Pacific. He utilized all of the methods of presentation, writing dozens of historical narratives, editing documents of the explorers by the score, publishing in facsimile original records and maps, and continuously by the spoken word giving life and vigor to the record. His range became so extensive that he gave up the mention of individual titles in *Who's Who,* save for his brilliant prize-winning synthesis *Forty-Niners: the Chronicle of the California Trail* (1931); but his bibliography published on the completion of twenty-five years of teaching included 101 entries.

A graduate of Marietta College in 1895, Professor Hulbert returned to his *Alma Mater* after nine years as professor of American history, and was associated thereafter chiefly with that institution and Colorado College. He was already deeply immersed in his *Historic Highways* when, after a journalistic fling in Korea, he began to teach at Marietta; and in this series of sixteen volumes he found the major theme for his life. The interest in the West that Turner aroused gave reason for a development of the underlying geography and history of western penetration. Hulbert followed the trails himself, camera and original surveyor's plat in hand, until of his own knowledge he mastered much of that about which discoverers had written. His contributions will have permanent value.

While at Marietta, and later, his mind was open to other aspects of the West than the topographical. Interested in Washington as a Western, he acquired an interest in him as a man and a farmer, and added intelligently to the Washington literature. Finding in his college the records of the Ohio Associates, he edited them with scholarly understanding, producing the standard work upon this experiment in controlled colonization. In his human

relations, Professor Hulbert was genial and expansive. Those who knew him well in the years when he was a regular attendant at the meetings of the American Historical Association will remember him, and will handle his immense output, conscious of an aromatic personality and of an unusual capacity to inspire and teach as well as to produce. F. L. P.

Charles Ramsdell Lingley, professor of history at Dartmouth College, died at Hanover on January 29 at the age of 56. A graduate of Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1900, he spent several years teaching in preparatory schools and in graduate work at Columbia University, where he took his doctorate with a dissertation upon *The Transition in Virginia from Colony to Commonwealth,* going to Dartmouth College in 1907. There he speedily won recognition as a remarkably successful teacher. With almost unfailing regularity of late years the senior class has voted that he was the most popular professor, a tribute which all who knew him and his work recognized as due to his extraordinary talent for imparting knowledge and inspiring his students with a genuine and abiding interest in history. His teaching was chiefly along two lines. As leader of the group engaged in teaching the general course in American history, he was inspiring to his colleagues and to the two or three sections which he taught in person. His advanced courses were chiefly in American biography. Some years before the present interest in biography developed, he began inducting groups of students into study from the sources upon notable American careers, rounding out the work with a critical examination of the treatment of salient features of each career by the leading biographers. Outside of Dartmouth Professor Lingley was known chiefly by his textbooks and as a specialist on recent American history. His *Since the Civil War* has been widely used in college classes. He also wrote elementary texts in collaboration with Professor R. M. Tryon and Mr. F. M. Morehouse. He was at the time of his death engaged in writing a life of Theodore Roosevelt for the American Political Leaders series. By colleagues, students, and friends Professor Lingley will be remembered as a man of rare charm. His keen mind, ready wit, and interest in others made him a delightful companion. F. M. A.

Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, a pioneer in the critical study of Southern history, died on January 21 at the age of 57. He was born at La Grange, Georgia, and took his first degree at the University of Georgia in 1897 and his Master's two years later. His doctorate was completed at Columbia University in 1902. His first book was on *Georgia and State Rights,* and this received the Justin Winsor Prize of the American Historical Association in 1901. He was for two years fellow and tutor at his *Alma Mater.* From 1902 to 1908 he taught at the University of Wisconsin, finally as assistant professor. Here he enjoyed the stimulating leadership of Frederick Jackson Turner. In 1908 he became professor of history and political science at Tulane University, going

in 1911 to the University of Michigan as professor of American history, where for eighteen years he did a most significant work. In 1929 he was called to Yale University. There he was regarded as a man of unusual interest, a teacher of great power, and a colleague always eager to coöperate in building up the department of history. When he knew that his career, at the very height of its productive scholarship, must come to a close he met the inevitable with a serene courage. For years he had been regarded as the leader in the newer studies of the civilization of the Old South. Other works followed his first publication: *History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt* in 1908; *Life of Robert Toombs* and *Correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb,* both in 1913; *American Negro Slavery* in 1918; and finally *Life and Labor in the Old South* in 1929. This last work had received the Little, Brown and Company's prize for the best unpublished work in American history. Professor Phillips had early realized that the plantation aristocracy dominated the social, economic, and political life of the South. His controlling interest, therefore, was the plantation unit of social and economic life in the Black Belt. He knew the plantation régime better than any other living man. He knew it as an industrial unit, as a system of racial adjustment and of social control. His volume on *Life and Labor in the Old South* is in a sense an idealization, partly because it dealt with one characteristic feature of the social system, and did not include other elements, the non-slaveholders, the manufacturers, miners, and bankers, in short the economic and cultural life outside the realm of slave-labor plantations. Other honors and duties came to Professor Phillips. In 1929-1930 he was Albert Kahn Fellow for a tour to central Africa and around the world. An influential member of the Council of the American Historical Association, he was chairman of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund committee and planned its schedule of important publications upon the origins of the great struggle of 1861–1865.

Arthur Edward Pearse Weigall, the well-known Egyptologist and biographer, died on January 2 at the age of 53. Prior to his retirement in 1914 he had been inspector general of antiquities for the Egyptian government. Among his books in this field were two on *Abydos* (1902, 1904), *Report on the Antiquities of Lower Nubia* (1907), and *The Treasury of Ancient Egypt* (1911). His *Life and Times of Cleopatra* (1914) was the first of his widely read biographies.

Pierre François Gustave de La Gorce, one of the most eminent of contemporary historians, died on January 2 at the age of 87. His greatest work, which combined the qualities of the best French historical writing, was his *Histoire du second Empire,* published in seven volumes (1894–1906). He also wrote on the religious history of the Revolution, upon the Restoration, and the Orleanist Monarchy. His last book was a small volume on *Napoléon*

III. et sa politique, which reached this country a few days before the news of his death.

Emmanuel Pierre Rodocanachi, a French historian and literary figure, died on January 8 at the age of 74. He was a banker, but his long list of notable books indicates that these were his primary interest. He wrote on the history of Italy and Rome during the Renaissance. His most recent and notable works were *Histoire de Rome: le pontificat de Jules II.* (1928), *Histoire de Rome: le pontificat de Léon X.* (1931), and *Histoire de Rome: les pontificats d'Adrien VI. et de Clément VII.* (1933).

A memorial volume has been devoted to the life and work of a well-known British historian: *Henry William Carless Davis, 1874–1928,* a Memoir by J. H. R. Weaver, and a Selection of his Historical Papers, edited by Mr. Weaver and Austin Lane Poole. The publisher is Constable (pp. vii, 217, 10*s.* 6*d.*).

Christian Pfister's life and his works are reviewed in the November *Revue historique,* the first by Henri Salomon, the second by Marc Bloch.

An interesting interpretation of the career of the late Camille Jullian, written by M. Maurice Toussaint, appears in the January number of the *Revue des questions historiques.* M. Charles Diehl has written of him in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of January 1.

Professor Otto Hoetzsch gives in the *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* (1933, no. 4) an estimate of the life and work of the late Russian historian S. F. Platonov, including part of an autobiographical account which Platonov drew up in 1926 for a projected work entitled "Geschichtswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen".

Upon November 29, which was the eightieth birthday of M. Gabriel Hanotaux, the distinguished historian and statesman, the members of the *Comité France-Amérique,* of which he was one of the founders in 1909, established a chair "Gabriel Hanotaux" at the *Institut des Études américaines à Paris.* This provides each year for a course of lectures dealing with some one of the countries of America. It may be added that at a banquet given in his honor M. Hanotaux's many admirers presented him with a medal commemorating his career. About the same time appeared the first volume of his memoirs, *Mon temps: De l'Empire à la République* (Plon, 20 fr.).

Professor A. T. Olmstead's address as president of the American Oriental Society, with the subject of New Testament Times—and Now, appears in *The Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1933, no. 4).

Dr. Constantine E. McGuire's address as president of the American Catholic Historical Association, entitled Christian Thought and Economic Policy, is published in the January *Catholic Historical Review.*

Dr. Charles A. Beard in February gave four lectures at the California Institute of Technology on What are National Interests?

The following appointments may be noted: at the *University of Chicago* Dr. S. Harrison Thomson as assistant professor of Modern history, beginning with the summer quarter, and Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy in Columbia University, as visiting professor of history for the year 1934–1935 to give courses on the intellectual history of Europe; Dr. Winfred A. Harbison, formerly of the Colleges of the City of Detroit, assistant professor of history in *Wayne University;* Dr. Hans Kohn, an authority on the history of nationalism, professor at *Smith College.*

Announcement is made of the appointment of visiting professors for the summer sessions of the following universities: *California* [Los Angeles], Avery O. Craven; *Chicago,* J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton; *Columbia,* Carl Becker, Nathaniel Schmidt, B. B. Kendrick; *Cornell,* Leo Gershoy; *Duke,* M. L. Bonham, W. F. Craven, O. J. Hale, Roy F. Nichols; *Johns Hopkins,* Charles S. Sydnor; *Minnesota,* Donald C. Babcock; *Missouri,* Herman Clarence Nixon; *Nebraska,* R. E. Reynolds, E. E. Dale; *New Hampshire,* Ernest S. Osgood; *Northwestern,* Charles E. Chapman; *Southern California* [Los Angeles], Clarence Perkins; *Stanford,* Ralph Henry Gabriel; *Virginia,* Charles Chilton Pearson; *Washington,* Arthur Charles Cole, Thomas Franklin Kane; *West Virginia,* R. D. W. Connor.

Conyers Read began his work of Professor of English history at the University of Pennsylvania in February. Professor Arthur C. Howland has been appointed to the Henry C. Lea Professorship in History at the same university, *vice* Professor E. P. Cheyney, retired.

Dr. Howard K. Beale will lecture at the University of Chicago in the spring quarter. The paper he presented at the Urbana meeting of the Association has been printed in the January *Progressive Education* under the title of Dare Society deny its Teachers Freedom?

Professor W. K. Boyd of Duke University is spending this semester on leave in Washington, D. C.

Dr. Curtis P. Nettels of the University of Wisconsin was promoted to the rank of full professor at the beginning of this academic year.

GENERAL

At the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies, held in Washington, D. C., on January 26 and 27, subventions were voted to a number of undertakings in the field of history. These include the Irish archæological survey being conducted by Harvard University; an epigraphical expedition to Northern Caria, under the auspices of the American Society

for Archæological Research in Asia Minor; and further excavations of Olynthus in Macedonia, under the direction of Professor David M. Robinson of The Johns Hopkins University. Assistance was also voted to the publication of a third volume in the series devoted to the history of the Philadelphia theater; to Dr. Frederica de Laguna's work on *The Archæology of Cook Inlet and Prince William Sound;* and to Professor George A. Reisner's work on *The Development of the Egyptian Tomb.* The Council also voted a subvention that would make possible the extension of the rotograph service of the Modern Language Association of America to include other fields than those of the modern languages. It will therefore soon be possible to secure photostat copies of complete manuscripts in foreign depositories in the fields of Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance history, as well as in those of the history of science and Oriental studies.

With the coöperation of the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Harvard Summer School will offer two twelve weeks' intensive courses in the Russian language to advanced students, not over thirty in number, who have some experience in research and who desire to gain a knowledge of Russian as a tool for investigation. Applications should be sent, not later than May 1, to the Director, R University Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

A Summer Seminar of Far Eastern Studies is to be held at the University of California, June 25-August 3. It is similar in plan to the seminar held at Harvard University in 1932. The sponsors are committees of the American Council of Learned Societies and the University of California.

The publication of the third volume of the great *Gesamtkatalog der preussischen Bibliotheken* last summer is convincing proof that the editors are making every endeavor to expedite the appearance of the respective volumes. Aided by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, the directors have been able to double the editorial staff and to provide for additional work. It is hoped that at least three volumes will appear annually; however, the end is not yet in sight, for it is estimated that the completed catalogue will comprise some 150 volumes. The excellence of this catalogue is all the more remarkable when one considers the magnitude of the task confronting the editors. Unlike the catalogue of the British Museum and that of the Bibliothèque nationale, the *Gesamtkatalog* lists, with certain exceptions, the entire contents of eighteen libraries. These are the Preussische Staatsbibliothek, the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Breslau, the university libraries at Halle, Marburg, Bonn, Münster, Göttingen, Kiel, Greifswald, and Berlin; the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Königsberg, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, the libraries of the technical schools at Aachen, Berlin, Breslau, Hanover, and Braunsberg; and the Nationalbibliothek at Vienna. Dr.

Hermann Fuchs, the editor in chief, has written an important explanation of the plans, work, and problems of the editors of the catalogue for *The Library Quarterly,* January, 1934. G. C. B.

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: Giovanni Costa, *Studi Cesariani* (N. Riv. Stor., Sept.).

The Librairie Ernest Leroux has begun the publication of the *Revue d'Égyptologie* for the Société française d'Égyptologie. It will appear in four fascicles a year and will deal with Egyptian philological and archæological problems from the origins until the Arab conquest. The subscription price is 200 francs.

No. 8 of the Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago is entitled *The Thutmosid Succession.* The author is William F. Edgerton (1933, pp. 43, $1.00).

Among the pamphlets recently published from the *Proceedings* of the British Academy (London, Humphrey Milford) one presents the Raleigh Lecture on History, by W. W. Tarn, on Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind, arguing that Alexander was the first to hold Greek and barbarian in equal regard, contemplating the brotherhood of man. Another, by H. Mattingly and E. S. G. Robinson, discusses the Date of the Roman Denarius and other landmarks in early Roman coinage, arguing for a much later date (187 B. C.) for the first issue of the denarius than has usually been set.

The late J. W. Headlam-Morley's *Election by Lot at Athens* (Cambridge University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1933, pp. xxvi, 315, $2.50), which gained the Prince Consort Prize in 1890, and was published the following year, has been reissued with a new preface and additional notes by Mr. D. C. MacGregor, of Balliol.

The following reports of excavations and discoveries are significant: H. Frankfort, Work of the Oriental Institute in Iraq, T. Leslie Shear, The Latter Part of the Agora Campaign of 1933, O. Broneer, Excavations in the Agora of Corinth, 1933, and News Items from Athens, by E. P. Blegen, all in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for December; H. G. G. Payne, Archaeology in Greece [1932–1933] in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* LIII., no. 2; reports of excavations and discoveries in Greece, the Dodecanese, and Asia Minor from Troy to Malatya in the *Archaeologischer Anzeiger,* 1933, no. 2; M. Y. Bequignon's report in the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique,* LVII., no. 1; and the report on Roman Britain in 1932 in the *Journal of Roman Studies,* XXIII., no. 2.

Ancient Italy and Modern Religion, the Hibbert Lectures for 1932, by

R. S. Conway (Cambridge University Press; New York, Macmillan, $3.50), is a charming series of six lectures which reviews some aspects of Italic religion and touches upon modern parallels. The author tells us little that is new, and at times is too sentimental in his interpretations, but he is vivid and entertaining and succeeds in making many interesting connections. Starting with the processional of ancient Iguvium and the modern festival of the Ceri in the same town, he goes on to discuss the goddess Rehtia and the use of the alphabet in the dedications of sacred buildings, Orphism and immortality, and Etruscan notions of punishment. In the later lectures he shows the effect of new ethical ideals upon the conceptions of the ancient deities in the first century B. C. He presents Dido's tragedy as Vergil's protest against the sins of nationalism, and the sacrifice of human values for reasons of state. The rites of the Saturnalia and the Child of the fourth Eclogue alike lead us to the discovery of Christmas. One may doubt the connection he finds between the murderous and luxurious villains of Roman history and their Etruscan names (p. 66); also that Georgics, 4, 219–227 really does represent Vergil's point of view (p. 85); and that Julius Caesar did stand for the view that the provinces were fields to be exploited by Roman governors. But Cicero labored and pleaded and died for the conception of a world community transcending the city-state (p. 124).

The History of the Second Jewish Commonwealth (Philadelphia, Dropsie College, 1933, pp. xii, 78) is intended as prolegomena to a work on the same subject which the author, Dr. Solomon Zeitlin, is preparing.

Articles: T. Fish, *Aspects of Sumerian Civilisation as evidenced on Tablets in the John Rylands Library* (Bull. John Rylands Library, Jan.); C. C. Edgar, *A Group of Zenon Papyri* (*ibid.*); H. L. Lorimer, *Pulvis et Umbra* (Jour. Hell. Stud., LIII., no. 2); W. Judeich, *Zur ionischen Wanderung* (Rhein. Mus., LXXXII., no. 4); A. N. Stillwell, *Eighth Century B. C. Inscriptions from Corinth* (Am. Jour. Arch., Dec.); J. A. O. Larsen, *The Constitution of the Peloponnesian League* [II.] (Class. Phil., Jan.); P. Roussel, *L'amende de Chios* (Rev. Études Anc., Dec.); H. Frank, *Ein Beitrag zur Ptolemaeerchronologie des III. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Archiv für Papyrusforsch., XI., nos. 1, 2); W. Peremans, *Ptolemée II. Philadelphe et les indigènes égyptiens* (Rev. Belge Phil. et Hist., Dec.); G. Daux, *Notes de chronologie delphique* (Bull. Corr. Hell., LVII., no. 1); M. Holleaux, *Une inscription de Séleucie de Piérie* (*ibid.*); A. Aymard, *Une hypothèse nouvelle sur les assemblées Achéennes* (Rev. Études Anc., Dec.); L. A. Holland, *Qui terminum exarasset* (Am. Jour. Arch., Dec.); A. Berthelot, *Les Ligures* (Rev. Arch., Oct.); L. Geweke, *Notes on the Political Relationship of Cicero and Atticus from 63–59 B. C.* (Class. Jour., Jan.); M. Gelzer, *Cato Uticensis* (Die Antike, X., no. 1); J. Kromayer, *Actium, ein Epilog* (Hermes, LXVIII., no. 4); T. Frank, *On Augustus and the Ærarium* (Jour. Rom. Stud., XXIII., no. 2);

A. Stein, *Die römische Staatszeitung und die Fasti ostienses* (Hist. Zeitsch., CXLIX., no. 2); R. O. Fink, *Jerash in the First Century A. D.* (Jour. Rom. Stud., XXIII., no. 2); H. M. D. Parker, *The Legions of Diocletian and Constantine* (*ibid.*); F. S. Salisbury, *The Notitia Dignitatum and the Western Mints* (*ibid.*); Gérard Walter, *Brutus, ou l'apprentissage du tyrannicide* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Jan.).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: E. Jordan, *Histoire ecclésiastique du Moyen Age* (Rev. Hist., Nov.); Gustave Krüger, *A Decade of Research in Early Christian Literature* (Harvard Theol. Rev., July); Joseph Koch, *Neuerscheinungen und Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (Hist. Jahrb., LIII., no. 3).

Probably the most important of the many significant articles published in *Byzantion,* VIII., no. 2, is A. A. Vasiliev's On the Question of Byzantine Feudalism. This is a revised translation into English of a chapter of his volume, written in Russian, on *The Latin Sway in the Levant* (Petrograd, 1923). Vasiliev discusses the striking parallels in the development of feudalism in the East when compared with feudal institutions of the West during medieval times. Admitting that until recently the term 'Byzantine feudalism' would have seemed a paradox, the author demonstrates the validity of such a term in the light of our present knowledge. The theories of Russian Byzantinists are discussed and criticized, thus allowing those who do not know Russian to profit from books, unfortunately, too little known.

In the *Transactions* of the Royal Historical Society, vol. XVI., are published two items of interest to medievalists. In a discussion of The Modern Methods for the Study of Medieval History and their Requirements Professor Powicke explains the necessity of coöperation between scholars if historical research, especially that in the medieval field, is to be effective. Professor Laistner in Bede as a Classical and a Patristic Scholar shows how extensively Bede read and how definitely he deserves to rank as a scholar. His *Retractions on the Acts* displays mature excellence. Here, especially, "Bede's judgement in his textual criticism is sound, his handling of quotations from the original Greek shows that his knowledge of that language near the end of his life was substantial, not superficial, and all through there appear to be much more of Bede's own thought and a far greater independence of authorities than in his other exegetical works". Yet in his use of the Greek fathers there was a complete dependence on Latin translations.

The volume entitled *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* (Berlin, Ebering, 1933, pp. 251, 10.80 M.) is a *Festschrift* offered to Professor Robert Holtzmann on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. Among the

notable essays which it contains are the following: Die Zeit der Entstehung von Einhards Vita Karoli, by M. Lintzel; Der Dictatus Papae, by R. Koebner; Die Frage der Bischofswahlen auf dem Würzburger Reichstag von 1133, by J. Bauermann; and Bischof Otto I. von Bamberg als Eigenklosterherr, ein kurialer Prozess aus den Jahren 1139 bis 1145/46, by A. Brackmann.

The *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (*Bulletin Du Cange*), 1933, no. 1, publishes Index scriptorum operumque latino-belgicorum medii aevi a Mauritio Helin conscriptus, an important and very useful list of authors and writings which are being examined by scholars preparing the new glossary for medieval Latin.

Articles: *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecae capituli ecclesiae cathedralis Beneventanae* (An. Boll., LI., nos. 3, 4); Johannes Spörl, *Das mittelalterliche Geschichtsdenken als Forschungsaufgabe* (Hist. Jahrb., LIII., no. 3); Bruno Krusch, *Die erste deutsche Kaiserkrönung in Tours, Weinachten 508* (Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, XXVIII., XXIX.); Helmut Weigel, *Studien zur Eingliederung Ostfrankens in das merowingisch-karolingische Reich* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Nov.); Solomon Katz, *Pope Gregory the Great and the Jews* (Jewish Quar. Rev., XXIV., no. 2); Paul Peeters, *Une vie grecque du pape S. Martin I.* (An Boll., LI., nos. 3, 4); J. Loth, *Le monachisme irlandais et le monachisme britton* (An. Bretagne, 1933, no. 3); Ph. Lauer, *La réforme carolingienne de l'écriture latine et l'école calligraphique de Corbie* (Mém. Acad. Inscr. et Belles-Lettres, XIII., no. 2); H. Grégoire, *Études sur le neuvième siècle* (Byzantion, VIII., no. 2); Fr. Dvornik, *Un second schisme de Photios: Une mystification historique* (*ibid.*); Louis Halphen, *La place de la royauté dans le système féodal* (Rev. Hist., Sept.); Albert Brackmann, *Die Ursachen der geistigen und politischen Wandlung Europas im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Hist. Zeitsch., Dec.); Hermann Maschek, *Kaiser Heinrich IV. und die Gründung des Chorherrenstiftes Klosterneuburg* (Mitteil. des Œsterr. Inst. f. Geschichtsf., XLVII., nos. 2, 3); Theodor Mayer, *Die älteren Urkunden des Klosters Klingenmünster* (*ibid.*); Harold Lamb, *The Road of the Crusaders* (Nat. Geog. Mag., Dec.); J. de Ghellinck, *La carrière de Pierre Lombard: Nouvelle précision chronologique* (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Jan.); Egon Schneider, *Ueber den Ursprung und die Bedeutung des Namens Rota als Bezeichnung für den obersten päpstlichen Gerichtshof* (Röm. Quartalsch., 1933, nos. 1, 2); J. C. Russell, *The Preferments and 'Adiutores' of Robert Grosseteste* (Harv. Theol. Rev., Oct.); Robert Steele, *Roger Bacon as Professor: a Student's Notes* (Isis, Nov.); Gerhard Schrader, *Die bischöflichen Offiziale Hildesheims und ihre Urkunden im späten Mittelalter, 1300–1600* (Arch. f. Urkendenforsch., XIII., no. 1); R. A. Newhall, *Payment to Pierre Cauchon for presiding at the Trial of Jeanne d'Arc* (Speculum, Jan.); Paul Nörlund, *Le*

Groenland au Moyen Age (Rev. Hist., Nov.); H. M. Legros and E. Kerchner, *Lettres d'indulgences de la cour de Rome au XV^e siècle* (Rev. Études Hist., Oct.); Karl Otto Müller, *Ein Schiffsraub im Mittelmeer zum Nachteil der grossen ravensburger Handelsgesellschaft, 1490,* (Vierteljahr. f. Soz. und Wirtschaftsgesch., XXVI., no. 4); B. von Arnim, *Die Stellung des Bulgarenfürsten Symeon zum Christentum* (Zeitsch. f. Slav. Philol., X., nos. 3, 4); Carl Neumann, *Ende des Mittelalters?* (Deutsche Vierteljahr, XII., no. 1).

G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: W. B. Kerr, *Historical Literature on Canada's Participation in the Great War* (Can. Hist. Rev., Dec.).

With the March number *Pacific Affairs,* issued by the Institute of Pacific Relations, hitherto from Honolulu, will be published quarterly from New York. The editor is Owen Lattimore. The historical, as well as other factors of the present situation in the Pacific, will be presented.

A correct evaluation of the Capuchin Order's activities during the period of the Catholic Reformation is of importance in determining how far it influenced the struggle for ecclesiastical power at that time. A step toward such evaluation is taken by P. Arsenius Jacobs in *Die rheinischen Kapuziner, 1611–1725: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Katholischen Reform* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1933, pp. xxii, 163).

Rivalry between Germany and England in South Africa in the last two decades of the nineteenth century should be one of the most fascinating and fruitful studies in the field of imperialism. The treatment of the outstanding events of the period in Professor Raymond Walter Bixler's *Anglo-German Imperialism in South Africa* (Baltimore, Warwick and York, 1932, pp. x, 181) is, however, disappointing. To be frank, this study merits sharp criticism on nearly every possible point—an unfortunate title, typographical inconsistency, the want of maps, the failure to explain the significance of persons suddenly introduced into the text, the uncritical use of the material, the dull style offending both grammar and rhetoric. If the appearance of *The Milner Papers* in 1931 was too late for use in this dissertation, no such excuse can be made for the omission of such obvious sources as Worsfold's *Lord Milner's Work in South Africa, 1897–1902,* the *Memoirs* of Paul Kruger, the important German *Kolonialblatt* and *Kolonialzeitung.* No use at all was made of the manuscript sources in the Public Record Office or in the *Reichsarchiv.* One can only say that a very great opportunity has been missed.

H. R. R.

The essays included in the volume entitled *The United States of Europe*

and Other Papers (New York, Reynal and Hitchcock, 1933, pp. 303, $2.50), by Sir Arthur Salter, edited by W. Arnold-Forster, were written by the author for the clarification of his opinions as one problem after another presented itself during his ten years' experience with the League of Nations. Several relate to matters which have passed into history, but were once of significant import: Economic Sanctions and the Geneva Protocol [1924]; The Greco-Bulgar Incident [1925]; and The Kellogg Pact [1928].

Europe since the Revolution (Boston, Ginn, 1934, pp. ix, 890, $4.00), by Franklin Charles Palm and Frederick E. Graham, emphasizes the rise of the middle classes to dominance in the Modern World. Nearly one-half of the volume is given to the causes and consequences of the War. One of the final chapters deals with The Pacific and the Revolt of Asia.

Professor F. Lee Benns has published a revised edition of his *Europe since 1914* (New York, F. S. Crofts, 1933, pp. xiv, 862, $3.50), originally published in 1930. New chapters have been added and others reconstructed, for it is a changed world even by comparison with the situations of 1929 or 1930.

Articles: Ch. Mercier, *L'esprit de Calvin et la démocratie* (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Jan.); Gerhard Ritter, *Die Ausprägung deutscher und westeuropäischer Geistesart im konfessionellen Zeitalter* (Hist. Zeitsch., Dec.); Alexander Brückner, *Aus dem religiösen Leben der Čechen und Polen* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., III., no. 4); Otto Hoetzsch, *Föderation und fürstliche Gewalt (Absolutismus) in der Geschichte Osteuropas im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*, IV., no. 1); F. C. Roux, *La domination égyptienne en Syrie, 1833–1840* (Rev. Hist. Col., July); Mario Bersano Begey, *La caduta della Repubblica di Cracovia nei carteggi diplomatici dei ministri Sardi* (Risorgimento Ital., Apr., 1933); Edmondo Cione, *Il plebiscito napoletano e l'azione di Francesco de Sanctis* (N. Riv. Stor., Sept.); Pierre Rain, *Delcassé et les accords de 1904: D'après de nouveaux documents* (Rev. Sci. Pol., Oct.); E. C. Helmreich, *Die Haldane Mission* (Berl. Monatsh., Feb.); Camille Bloch, *Les socialistes allemands pendant la crise de juillet 1914* (Rev. Hist. Guerre Mond., Oct.); Carl Mühlmann, *Deutsche Balkanpolitik im Weltkrieg, 1914–1918* (Eur. Gespräche, 1933, nos. 7, 8); Thomas A. Bailey, *The United States and the Blacklist during the Great War* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Paul Herre, *Die kleinen Staaten und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges: Belgien* [VI.] (Berl. Monatsh., Nov., Dec.); Edmund von Glaise-Horstenau, *Feldzeugmeister Potiorek* (*ibid.*, Feb.); F. Clément Simon, *Les derniers mois de la guerre en Russie: L'expédition d'Arkhangel* (Rev. Hist. Dipl., Oct.).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

General review: W. F. Craven, *Historical Study of the British Empire* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.).

With the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research for November appears the fourth supplement to the Guide to the Historical Publications of the Societies of England and Wales. The same number contains a survey of Irish Records, 1920–1933.

The Oxfordshire Archaeological Society has published *The Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Michael's Church, Oxford,* edited by H. E. Salter. They open in 1404 and are among the oldest which are preserved in England.

University College at Cardiff has published *An Historical Map of South Wales and the Border Counties in the Fourteenth Century,* prepared by Professor William Rees. It is composed of four sheets and is accompanied by an explanatory handbook. The scale of the map is half an inch to the mile. It is printed in seven colors. With its assistance the student of Welsh and border history will be able to locate important lordships or honors, monasteries, and manors. He will also be able to note the progress of the Anglo-Norman invasion.

Walter Alison Phillips is the editor of three volumes on the *History of the Church of Ireland,* the first of which, entitled *The Celtic Church,* has been published (Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xii, 437, 31*s.* for the set).

A biography which throws light upon a troubled period of Irish history is *Gerald FitzGerald, the Great Earl of Kildare* (Dublin, Talbot Press, 1933, pp. xxiv, 305, 20*s.*), by the late Donough Bryan, with a foreword by Professor Edmund Curtis. Although Kildare supported the claims of Lambert Simnel he did not forfeit the favor of Henry VII., who called him "his rebel". The reason was probably more the immense influence which the family had in Ireland than even the attractive character of the earl. The author has been able to add some new material to that already published in Miss Conway's *Henry VII.'s Relations with Scotland and Ireland.*

The "Appleton Biographies" (D. Appleton-Century Company) are volumes, for the most part competently written, of approximately a hundred and fifty small pages each. Among the British personages included are: Sir John Fortescue's *Marlborough,* Mona Wilson's *Queen Elizabeth,* G. J. Renier's *William of Orange,* Arthur Bryant's *Macaulay,* James Laver's *Wesley,* and G. M. Young's *Gibbon.*

The Diary of Benjamin Newton, 1816–1818, edited by C. P. Fendall and E. A. Crutchley (Cambridge University Press), adds another to the list of diaries of parsons so useful to students of the history of the Church of Eng-

land. In the years covered by his diary Newton had a living in the North Riding of Yorkshire.

Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell in the third part of their *History of Everyday Things in England* (Batsford) cover the period 1733–1851, in substantially the same manner as the other periods. The subtitle, "The Rise of Industrialism", indicates the added complications as the authors undertake to deal with more recent times.

Bernard M. Allen's *Gordon in China* (Macmillan), based in part on hitherto unused papers, deals with Charles George Gordon's career in the country where he first achieved fame.

Gilbert Salter's *Growth of Modern England* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1933, pp. xi, 642, $4.00) is a revision of his *Making of Modern England*, published twenty years ago. It has been largely rewritten, and now includes "a study of the main lines of social and economic development in the eighteenth century". There is no attempt to deal with either the World War or the post-war period.

The Clubs of Augustan London, by Robert J. Allen (Harvard University Press), though it deals with a subject of interest to students of the general history of the time, is based almost exclusively on the conventional sources for literary history. Therefore it is not a satisfactory treatment of the subject, though it contains interesting information.

Cavalier: Letters of William Blundell to his Friends, 1620–1698, edited by Margaret Blundell (Longmans), is a collection of family papers illustrating the hard and adventurous life of a Roman Catholic loyalist in a time when the hands of most Englishmen were turned against adherents to his faith.

The second volume of *The Queen and Mr. Gladstone* (Hodder and Stoughton), edited by Philip Guedalla, covers the period from 1880 to 1898, and contains 856 letters of which 620 have never been published. They show how the queen interpreted in daily practice her duties as a constitutional monarch. The situation was often rendered more difficult by a conflict of temperament between herself and her minister.

Among recent publications of H. M. Stationery Office are: *Calendar of State Papers*, Colonial series, *America and the West Indies*, January, 1719–February, 1720 (pp. lxiii, 435, 30*s*.), edited by Cecil Headlam; *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts*, principally Venetian, vol. XXXIV., 1664–1666 (pp. iv, 410, 30*s*.), edited by Allen B. Hinds; *Calendar of Treasury Books*, October, 1697, to August, 1698, vol. XIII. (pp. vii, 600, 30*s*.), edited by William A. Shaw; *Calendar of Close Rolls, Henry VI.*, vol. I., 1422–1429 (pp. vii, 705, 42*s*.).

Other British and Irish documentary publications are *Feet of Fines, Northumberland and Durham,* Publications of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Records Committee, vol. X.; *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland,* 3d series, vol. XIV. (Edinburgh, H. M. Register House), edited by Henry Paton, with an introduction by Robert Kerr Hannay; *The Miscellaneous Papers of Captain Thomas Stockwell, 1597–1614,* vol. II., Publications of the Southampton Record Society, edited by J. Rutherford; *The Chronicle of Ireland, 1584–1608* (Dublin Stationery Office), by Sir James Parrott, edited by Herbert Wood.

Articles: Erwin F. Meyer, *English Medieval Textile Codes* (Rocky Mountain Law Rev., Dec.); M. L. W. Laistner, *Source-Marks in Bede Manuscripts* (Jour. Theol. Stud., Oct.); Herbert Chitty, *Some Winchester College Muniments* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); N. Denholm Young, *The Winchester-Hyde Chronicle* (*ibid.*); F. M. Salter, *Skelton's* Speculum principis (Speculum, Jan.); G. Constant, *La chute de Somerset et l'élévation de Warwick: Leurs consequences pour la Réforme en Angleterre, octobre, 1549–juillet, 1553* (Rev. Hist., Nov.); A. K. Jameson, *Some New Spanish Documents dealing with Drake* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Leo Hicks, *The English College, Rome and Vocations to the Society of Jesus, March, 1579–July, 1595* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu, Jan.); *John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher, 1579–1601* (Library, Dec.); James P. R. Lyell, *King James I. and the Bodleian Library Catalogue of 1620* (Bodleian Quar. Rec., 1933, no. 3); Godfrey Davies, *The Parliamentary Army under the Earl of Essex, 1642–5* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); H. Hale Bellot, *Parliamentary Printing, 1660–1837* (Bull. Inst. Hist. Research, Nov.); Clifford Leach, *The Political Disloyalty of Thomas Southerne* (Mod. Lang. Rev., Oct.); Alfred Welby, *The Royal Navy, 1775* (Notes and Queries, Jan. 6); G. H. Guttridge, *Whig Opposition in England during the American Revolution* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Owen E. Holloway, *George Ellis, the Anti-Jacobin, and the Quarterly Review* (Rev. Eng. Studies, Jan.); W. O. Henderson, *The Liverpool Office in London* (Economica, Nov.).

FRANCE

The French association of archivists has begun a quarterly bulletin, entitled *Gazette des Archives.* It is edited by MM. J. de Font-Réaulx, archivist of the Drôme, and H. Chobaut, archivist of Vaucluse. It will include special bibliographies and summary studies of collections, as well as matters of interest to the personnel.

In *Comptes du trésor, 1296, 1316, 1384, 1477* (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1930, pp. lxxii, 329) [Recueil des historiens de la France, Documents financiers, vol. II.], Professor Robert Fawtier has edited, very carefully and with adequate critical comment, the extant unpublished *comptes* of the French treasury for the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. These

records are neither numerous nor extensive in view of the length of time involved, only that for 1477 being complete. Their value is sharply limited by their nature since they are merely rather summary statements of amounts credited to or debited from the crown through the treasury. They contain no references to the authorized expenses of the accountants or to many other essential factors although it is possible that they were checked, as they were constructed, against records which did contain these items. Moreover, there are other extant accounts of the treasury still unpublished although not technically belonging to this series. A notable feature of the present edition is the group of tables at the end of the preface which set forth the balance sheet of the treasury in its account with the crown for each of the terms for which we have evidence either in the documents here printed or elsewhere in records of the *Magna recepta, Magna expensa* type (1226, 1238, 1286–1293, 1295–1296, 1298–1299, 1301, 1316, 1322–1325, 1327, 1329, 1349, 1384, 1408, 1420, 1477). S. R. P.

A sumptuous volume on *La Révolution de 1789* is to open the new series L'histoire vivante. The editor is Professor Philippe Sagnac. It is to be composed of the most significant passages on the Revolution from Thiers and Michelet, through the long list, down to Mathiez and Madelin. The iconography of the epoch, which constitutes a rich collection of illustrations in color, photographic reproductions, and facsimiles, is under the charge of M. Jean Robiquet, *conservateur* of the Musée Carnavalet. The publishers are Les Éditions Nationales, and the subscription price is 365 francs.

The *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* for November is devoted chiefly to the occasion of the unveiling of a bust of Robespierre at Arras on October 15, 1933. There is a picture of the bust, which is by Cladel; also a portrait of Albert Mathiez, leader in the movement for the historical rehabiliation of Robespierre. The principal address is by Georges Lefebvre.

Some leaves of laurel are plucked from the crown of Camille Desmoulins by Henri Calvet in an article entitled Un plagiat de Camille Desmoulins, published in the November *Revue historique*. M. Calvet shows through the instrumentality of the parallel column that the first part of the famous No. 3 of the *Vieux Cordelier*, with its supposed translations from Tacitus for the purpose of discrediting the Terror, was borrowed from Thomas Gordon's *Discours sur Salluste*. This adds interest to the announcement that a critical edition of the *Vieux Cordelier*, prepared by M. Calvet, and with the use of notes left by the late Professor Mathiez, is to be added to the Classiques de la Révolution française.

A new volume added to the publication of the Société de l'histoire de France is *Mémoires de mon émigration* (Champion, 1933, pp. 240, 40 fr.), by

L'abbé de Fabry, and edited by Ernest d'Hauterive. The *abbé* wandered on foot through all northern Europe and even ventured into Siberia.

The collection entitled *French Revolution Documents, 1789–1794* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1933, pp. x, 287, 8*s.* 6*d.*), edited by J. M. Thompson, practically ignores the Old Régime, and excludes many important documents of the Revolution, *e.g.*, the decree of November 2, 1789, on the church lands, Louis's letter of April 23, 1791, to foreign courts, and the decree of May 7, 1794, on the Worship of the Supreme Being. Moreover, it lacks the unity which explanatory notes would provide; and it fails to indicate all omissions. It might be possible, however, to excuse these oversights in a book of great utilitarian value. But it seems rather improbable that Oxonians doing "Special Subjects" in the "Honour School of Modern History", for whom the volume is primarily intended, would find Mr. Thompson's collection of documents a satisfactory substitute for the use of the original materials available in their own venerable libraries. And American students, many of whom unfortunately do not read French, doubtless will prefer to continue using the few available copies of Anderson's *Constitutions and Documents* or the pertinent sections of the University of Pennsylvania *Translations and Reprints.* In the last analysis, Mr. Thompson has produced a volume which might have satisfied a great need, but which instead is at once inadequate and unworthy of his ability as a scholar. J. H. S.

The Librairie Plon has added to its popular Bibliothèque historique new editions of Léonce Pingaud's *Bernadotte et Napoléon* (15 fr.), and of the *Souvenirs de la comtesse de la Bouère: La guerre de la Vendée.*

One of the oldest French periodicals, the *Correspondant,* which especially in its earlier years published much which was of importance historically, ceased to appear with its number dated October 25. It was founded in 1829.

Jules Deschamps's *Chateaubriand en Angleterre* (Paris, Albert, 1934) contains a number of short essays on Chateaubriand's connections with England chiefly in the years 1818 to 1824. The most important of these studies is one on the dismissal of Chateaubriand in 1824 based on an unpublished report of a British diplomatic agent. F. B. A.

In *La vie tragique de Lamennais* (Paris, Alcan, 1933) Victor Giraud has written the best short account of Lamennais's career. The work is based on a thorough knowledge of the literature and is presented in an interesting and attractive form. F. B. A.

Articles: L. Mirot, *La politique française en Italie sous le règne de Charles VI. (1380–1422): Les préliminaires de l'alliance florentine* (Rev. Études Hist., Oct.); Leonhard von Muralt, *Die Ursachen der Religionskriege*

in Frankreich (Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch., 1933, nos. 2, 3); G. Zeller, *La monarchie d'Ancien Régime et les frontières naturelles* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Aug.); Ch. Edmond Perrin, *La Chronique de Chaumousey: Contribution à l'histoire ancienne de l'abbaye de Remiremont* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 4); Lucien Braye, *La famille de Riguet* (An. l'Est, 1933, no. 4); Georges Baumont, *Les mémoires de François de Riguet, grand prévôt de Saint-Dié* (*ibid.*); Gh. de Boom, *La collaboration de la France et des Pays-Bas autrichiens pendant le guerre de Sept Ans* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Nov.); Henri Sée, *Notes sur les travaux dans les ports bretons au XVIII^e siècle* (An. Bretagne, 1933, no. 3); L. Vignols, *Les améliorations anciennes du port de Saint-Malo, surtout au XVIII^e siècle* (*ibid.*); J. Lejeune, *Le port de Pontrieux* (*ibid.*); Paul Jeulin, *Un page de l'histoire du commerce nantais, 1530 environ–1733* (*ibid.*); F. L. Nussbaum, *The Deputies Extraordinary of Commerce and the French Monarchy* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec.); Hervé du Halgouet, *Inventaire d'une habitation à Saint-Dominique* (Rev. Hist. Col., July); L. de Cardenal, *Sur le "complot maçonnique" de 1789* (Rév. Fr., Oct.); Yvonne Forado-Cunéo, *Les ateliers de charité pendant la Révolution* (*ibid.*); J. M. Thompson, *'Le Maitre, alias Mara'* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Louis Gottschalk, *The Peasant in the French Revolution* [a discussion of two recent books by Georges Lefebvre] (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec.); Edmond Soreau, *Résurrection religieuse après la Terreur* (Rev. Études Hist., Oct.); G. Constant, *Le réveil religieux en France au début du XIX^e siècle* [concl'd] (Rev. Hist. Ecclés., Jan.); Robert Marjolin, *Troubles provoqués en France par la disette de 1816–1817* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Nov.); J. Signoret, *Le débarquement de la duchesse de Berry sur les côtes de Provence* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Jan.).

Documents: Jean Hanoteau, ed., *Conversation de M. le comte de Metternich avec l'empereur Napoléon telle que Sa Majesté me l'a racontée* [unpublished account by Caulaincourt of the Dresden interview, June, 1813] (Rev. Hist. Dipl., Oct.); Paul Tisseau, ed., *Un fragment des mémoires du comte de la Gardie* [Swedish minister to Spain describes his visit to Paris, Sept.-Oct., 1815] (*ibid.*); Alfred Stern, ed., *Eine Unterhaltung Emile Olliviers mit Georg Klindworth, Paris, 15. März 1870* (Hist. Zeitsch., Dec.).

BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS

General review: Hans Van Werveke, *Histoire de Belgique* (Rev. Hist., Sept.).

The first of the contributions in *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen van het Historisch Genootschap,* vol. LIV. (Utrecht, Kemink and Son, 1933, pp. lxiii, 59), is an interesting article by S. P. L'Honoré Naber on the conquest and occupation of Angola by the Dutch from 1641 to 1648, as described in an

official report written by Pieter Mortamer and addressed to the Chamber of Zeeland of the Dutch East India Company. This report is published by Mr. Naber from the original document in the government archives at The Hague, together with a brief pamphlet (Knuttel 5780) dealing with the victory of the Dutch over the Portuguese under the direction of Ouman. The second article contains financial accounts of the city of Delft relating to the part played by this city in the war of independence from 1572 to 1577. They have been edited by J. H. van Dijk. The third article presents four brief reports of itineraries in various parts of the northern Netherlands made about the year 1527 by the secretary of Naarden. The editor is Dr. D. Th. Enklaar. The fourth and last contribution is by H. van Alfen, who has published a number of documents which throw much light on André Bourlette, an intimate friend of William the Silent during the campaign across the Meuse in 1568. The introduction and annotations are excellent. A. H.

Fontes Egmundenses (Utrecht, Kemink and Son, 1933, pp. 181, 317) [Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap], edited by O. Oppermann, contains in the first place a bibliographical survey of the sources and the secondary works devoted to them—a total of fifty-two titles, of which the most important are a study in three parts by O. Oppermann himself (*Untersuchungen zur nordniederländischen Geschichte des 10. bis 13. Jahrhunderts*) and a German dissertation entitled *Zur Kritik der Annales Egmundani,* by K. Haenchen. There follows a detailed discussion of the sources which are edited and published in this volume. They have been divided by the editor in four groups, namely, the *Vita Sanctorum,* in three parts; the sources collected in the Cartularium of the abbey of Egmond, in four parts; the *Annales Egmundenses,* which have been published several times before, notably by Pertz in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica;* and twenty-four documents covering the years 889–1215 in the history of the abbey of Egmond. Copious annotations enhance the value of this useful volume. A. H.

The Académie royale de Belgique has issued *Bulletins* II. and III. of vol. XCVII., the first made up of reports and of papers presented at the session of June 27, the second of Documents pour servir à l'histoire de la maison de Bourgogne en Brabant et en Limbourg, fin du XIV^e^ siècle, edited by H. Laurent and F. Quicke.

Articles: A. De Smet, *Het waterwegennet ten Noordoosten van Brugge in de XIII^e^ Eeuw: Oude Zwin, Reie en Zwin* (Rev. Belge Philol. et Hist., Oct.); Michel Huisman, *Willem Usselinx, un progandiste colonial* (Bull. Soc. Royal Belge de Géog., 1933); Michel de Witte de Haelen, *La commission hollando-belge d'Utrecht, constituée par le traité du 19 avril, 1839* (Rev. Hist. Mod., Aug.).

NORTHERN EUROPE

Volume II. of Edw. Ortved's study in the history of the Cistercian Order in the North, the first volume of which was published in 1927, came from the press during the past year under the editorship of Franz Jaworski, the author having died in 1930. The work is a general history of the order, with a comprehensive account of the Cistercian houses in Sweden. The author had planned two additional volumes to deal with the order in Norway and Denmark, but these will not be published (*Cistercieordenen og dens Klostre i Norden,* Copenhagen, 1933).

An outstanding article in the Norwegian *Historisk Tidsskrift* of the past year (nos. 2 and 3) is a study by Hallvard Trætteberg of the symbols of Norwegian statehood in use from the earliest times to 1814 (*Norges statssymboler til 1814*). The author deals with such matters as the royal title, coats of arms, effigies on coins, and the great seal.

The problem of the Åland Islands, which has on occasion disturbed the calm of the capitals in the Baltic area, has been made the subject of a historical and political investigation by Friedrich Vortisch (*Die Ålandfrage,* Berlin, Heymann, 1933, pp. 214).

The fourth volume of Eirik Hornborg's history of Finland brings to a close a work of unusual merit and importance. The volume traces the story of the Finnish people while 'on the road to Freedom', and carries it down to the revolutionary movement that followed the collapse of Russia in 1917 (*Finlands hävder, IV., Finlands väg til frihet,* Helsingfors, 1933).

Vilhelm Marstrand's history of Aabenraa (*Aabenraa, c. 1028–1523,* Copenhagen, Petersen, 1933) is in part a substantial history of a medieval town in Denmark, and in part a discussion of early historic movements of peoples into and from the Jutish peninsula, which, like most discussions of this character, is likely to be of a highly speculative order.

Under the auspices of the Osteuropa-Institut Dr. Otto Auhagen has published *Die Bilanz des ersten Fünfjahrplanes der Sovetwirtschaft* (Breslau, Verlag Priebatsch's Buchhandlung, 1933, pp. 75, 2.50 M.).

Articles: Sigismond M. Jedlicki, *La création du premier archevêché polonais à Gniezno et ses conséquences au point de vue des rapports entre la Pologne et l'Empire germanique* (Rev. Hist. de Droit Français et Étranger, Oct.); Lis Jacobsen, *Moderne runeforskning* [runic research in recent times] (Scandia, 1933, no. 2); Per Sörensson, *En relation av pfalzgreven Karl Gustav om slaget vid Breitenfeld* [Count Palatine Karl Gustav's account of the battle of Breitenfeld] (*ibid.*); Marquis de Saint Pierre, *Les Normands en Amérique avant Christophe Colomb* (Rev. Ques. Hist., Nov.); Alf Kjellén, *Geijer och fattigdomsproblemet t. o. m. riksdagen, 1840–1841* [Geijer and the

problem of poor relief before and during the parliamentary sessions of 1840–1841] (Hist. Tidskrift, Swedish, 1933, no. 3); Robert Stupperich, *Brandenburgisch-russische Verhandlungen über Aufnahme der Hugenotten in Russland* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., IV., no. 1); A. N. Makarov, *Svod Zakonov (1833–1933): Zum hundertjährigen Jubiläum der Kodifikation des russischen Rechts* (*ibid.*); Hans Mortensen, *Neues zur Frage der mittelalterlichen Nordgrenze der Litauer* (Zeitsch. f. Slav. Philol., X., nos. 3, 4); Victor Frank and Ernst Schüle, *Graf Pavel Andreevič Šuvalov, russischer Botschafter in Berlin, 1885–1894* (Zeitsch. f. Osteur. Gesch., III., no. 4).

Documents: D. O. Schabert, ed., *Die Märtyrakte des revalschen Bischofs Platon vom Jahre 1919* (Zeitsch. f. Kirchengesch., 1933, nos. 2, 3).

L. M. L.

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: a journal relating to navigation of the Mississippi River, undated, but of about 1770; photostats of letters from Thomas Jefferson to Caesar Rodney, 1800, 1802, and to Joel Barlow, 1809 (3 pieces); "Notes on the United States of America collected in the years" 1804–1807, 1811, 1812, by Sir Augustus John Foster (5 volumes); "Sketches of Religious Experiences", in and near New York City, 1811 to May, 1858, by Jeremiah H. Taylor (1 volume); photostat of draft of report from John Randolph Clay, secretary of U. S. legation, Russia, to William Wilkins, U. S. envoy to Russia, 1834; letters from George B. McClellan to his daughter, 1859 to 1882 (12 pieces); photocopies of letters from Alpheus S. Bloomfield, private, Union army, to members of his family, 1861 to 1865 (324 pages); additional papers of Robert G. Ingersoll, 1871 to 1932 (456 pieces); papers of William A. Croffut, mainly relating to the Anti-Imperialist League, 1890 to 1916 (6 boxes); additional papers or copies of papers of George Washington, John D. Caton, James A. Bayard, Thomas F. Bayard, Benjamin F. Butler; and papers of J. Laurence Laughlin respecting the origins of the Federal Reserve System.

The resolution of Congress, adopted last June, that both the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence should be printed once more has resulted in a reprint of considerable historical interest. As explained in an extended supplementary note the Declaration was originally printed by John Dunlap of Philadelphia, and the Constitution by Dunlap and Claypoole. The reproduction by the Government Printing Office is in the same typographic style, except that because of the reduction of the size of the sheet Caslon 10-point has been used instead of Caslon pica. The type of the Con-

stitution has for similar reasons been reduced from small-pica. The booklet has also been provided with a name and a subject index.

The Historic American Buildings Survey is one of the tasks of the C. W. A. of great interest to students of American culture. For this purpose the services of about one thousand unemployed architects and draftsmen have been secured. The place of deposit for drawings and photographs is the Library of Congress. The National Advisory Committee includes Dr. Leicester B. Holland, of the Library of Congress, and Professor Herbert E. Bolton, of the University of California.

The third and final volume of the *History of the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration* opens with the "News Releases". One of its most useful contributions is George Washington Every Day: a Calendar of Events and Principles of his Entire Lifetime, by David M. Matteson. Edgar Erskine Hume is the author of an account of George Washington and the Society of the Cincinnati, and Lawrence Martin, The Dates of Naming Places and Things for George Washington. The Director, Representative Sol Bloom, has brought together material on the Date of George Washington's Birth, explaining the differences between the Old Style and New Style calendar.

The centenary of the death of the Marquis de Lafayette is to be recalled at meetings held this year under the auspices of The American Friends of Lafayette. There will be a memorial service in Washington on May 20. Among other similar services one will be held in Boston on June 17 by the Bunker Hill Monument Association. Appropriately there appears at this time, issued by the Institut Français de Washington, a handsome volume by J. Bennett Nolan, entitled *Lafayette in America Day by Day*.

The *Forty-eighth Annual Report* of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1930–1931 (Washington, 1933, pp. 1220), is made up chiefly of an index to the forty-eight reports of the bureau, compiled by Biren Bonnerjea.

Miss Ellen Semple's *American History and its Geographic Conditions*, which appeared in 1903 (see vol. IX., p. 571) has been revised by Professor C. F. Jones, in collaboration with the author. The format of the book is completely changed. Many maps and supplementary readings have been added. There is a valuable literary reading list, marred only by the naïveté of the accompanying comments. Throughout the revised work the vigorous hand of Professor Jones is evident, but the laws of Ratzel rather than the modern technique of Jones (*vide South America*) continue to dominate the volume. Nothing has appeared during the last thirty years to supplant this pioneer work although the subject is a challenging one. J. E. P.

In the volume entitled *Philip Mazzei, Friend of Jefferson: his Life and Letters* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1933, pp. 179, $2.00)

Richard Cecil Garlick, jr. has traced Mazzei through a long and varied life spent alternately in Europe and America. In his letters we read of the large plans for transforming the Blue Ridge into the Apennines, covered with vines and olive trees, of his unsuccessful attempts to borrow money in Europe as the agent of Virginia during the Revolution, and of his last years in Europe, when he assiduously cultivated the great and the near-great, and wrote long letters to his American friends. It was at this time that he wrote four volumes on the history of the United States and two volumes of memoirs, all characteristically serious. They constitute his most enduring accomplishments. The book is well edited and the author has done his work conscientiously, but its usefulness is practically limited to those who read Italian, for almost two-thirds of Mazzei's letters and other writings are untranslated.

P. G. D.

To the useful "Who's Who" directories of noteworthy persons has been added *The American Catholic Who's Who* (Detroit, Romig and Company, pp. xv, 513, $3.75). It contains 6000 entries. According to the plan editions are to be issued every two years. The volume is furnished with a geographical index.

The *Political and Social Growth of the United States, 1852–1933* (New York, Macmillan, 1933, pp. xi, 564, $3.00), by Professor Arthur Meier Schlesinger has been issued in a revised edition.

The lectures delivered at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, by Professor Clarence A. Berdahl, of the University of Illinois, have been published by the Institute under the title of *The Policy of the United States with respect to the League of Nations* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. 129, $3.50).

Historians interested in contemporary social thought in general and in the rôle of the schools in social and cultural change in particular will find critical analyses of the social beliefs of seventeen contemporary American educators in Dr. Norman Woelfel's *Molders of the American Mind* (Columbia University Press, 1933, $3.00). The development of democratic collectivism in the social thought of certain educators is sympathetically traced. Dr. Woelfel has preceded his interesting and frequently brilliant analyses by an interpretative historical essay which discusses the decline of the Christian tradition and the business régime, and the beginnings of cultural distinction and independence in America.

M. C.

Articles: John J. Meng, *Franco-American Diplomacy and the Treaty of Paris* (Records Am. Cath. Hist. Soc., Sept.); Richard R. Stenberg, *The Boundaries of the Louisiana Purchase* (Hispan. Am. Hist. Rev., Feb.); T. R. Shellenberg, *Jeffersonian Origins of the Monroe Doctrine* (*ibid.*); George

Fort Milton, *Douglas' Place in American History* (Jour. Illinois State Hist. Soc., Jan.); Jeannette P. Nichols, *Silver Diplomacy* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec.); Charles A. Beard, *The Historical Approach to the New Deal* (Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., Feb.).

Documents: *The Deputy Adjutant General's Orderly Book* (Colonel John Trumbull) [concl'd] (Bull. Fort Ticonderoga Museum, Jan.).

THE NORTH ATLANTIC COLONIES AND STATES

To the publication of Judge Carroll T. Bond's *Proceedings of the Maryland Court of Appeals, 1695–1729,* carried out by the Littleton-Griswold Committee of the American Historical Association, the Colonial Society of Massachusetts has added an equally important contribution in colonial legal history, the *Records of the Suffolk County Court, 1671–1680,* in two parts, making two handsome volumes of a total of 1233 pages. The editor is Professor Samuel Eliot Morison, with whom Professor Zechariah Chafee has coöperated.

Among the important additions to the collections of newspapers belonging to the American Antiquarian Society are fourteen of the first fifteen volumes of the Saratoga *Sentinel,* 1819–1833. Volume thirteen is yet to be acquired. This journal is of interest in the earlier history of the famous spa, now being restored as a state park. Other newspapers added are Holt's New York *Journal and General Advertiser* for the years 1774–1776. Still another is the first volume of Philip Freneau's *Time Piece and Literary Companion.* The Kingston, Canada, *Gazette* for 1810–1812 throws light on the period of the 1812 War. As spelling books have played their part in the development of American civilization, it is worth noting that the society possesses twenty-six editions of Thomas Dilworth's *A New Guide to the English Tongue,* first published in England in 1740, brought to America by Franklin, and popular until 1822. Of readers, spellers, and primers, in general, the society has nearly 1000 titles. A rare book of importance in studying the European reaction to the Revolution, and recently presented to the society, is Christoph Korn's *Geschichte der Kriege in und ausser Europa vom Anfange des Aufstandes der brittischen Kolonien in Nordamerika,* in thirty parts, Nuremberg, 1776–1784.

The New London County Historical Society has published as its second volume *Connecticut's Naval Office at New London during the War of the American Revolution* (New London, 1933, pp. xvii, 358), edited by Ernest E. Rogers, honorary president of the society. It is mainly concerned with the activities of Nathaniel Shaw, jr., a merchant, whose career covered the period from 1763 to 1782, and who served as Continental, Colonial, and state naval

agent. One chapter deals with the Naval Office, and another with the First Naval Expedition under the Authority of Congress. Both embody unpublished letters. The latter half of the volume includes Shaw's Mercantile Letter Book, the letters drawn from the whole period of his active life, and illustrating many phases of the Revolutionary struggle.

The January *New York History* is devoted to accounts and records of the annual meeting of the New York State Historical Association at Ticonderoga last September, together with certain addresses delivered there.

The Pennsylvania Historical Association has opened the year with the publication of a historical review entitled *Pennsylvania History*. The leading article is Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox's address, Greetings from a Neighbor, delivered at the first meeting of the association last April. Professor Paul W. Gates gives a survey of Research Projects in Pennsylvania History, Mr. William A. Itter describes Early Labor Troubles in the Schuylkill Anthracite District, while Dr. W. F. Dunaway contributes A Brief Bibliography of Pennsylvania History for High School Teachers, and Dr. Curtis W. Garrison records Recent Accessions of Various Depositories. Professor Roy F. Nichols adds a brief sketch of the origin of the association. Dr. Arthur C. Bining is the editor of the review, and the publishers are the University of Pennsylvania Press.

Articles: Raymond P. Stearns, *The New England Way in Holland* (New Eng. Quar., Dec.); Perry Miller, *The Half-Way Covenant* (*ibid.*); Henry S. Commager, *Tempest in a Boston Tea Cup* (*ibid.*); Jonathan T. Lincoln, *The Machine Age in New England* (*ibid.*); Henry W. Lawrence, *Samuel Sewall, Revealer of Puritan New England* (South Atlantic Quar., Jan.); Jonathan Procter, *Diary kept at Louisburg, 1759–1760* (Essex Institute Hist. Coll., Jan.); *Ship Registers of the District of Newburyport, 1789–1870* (*ibid.*); Paul Kiniery, *Efforts made by Religious Groups to maintain Peace in Early New York* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Richard Schermerhorn, jr., *Representative Pioneer Settlers of New Netherland and their Original Home Places* (New York Geneal. and Biog. Rec., Jan.); Moses Bigelow, *The Old Mine Road* (Proc. New Jersey Hist. Soc., Jan.); Richard R. Stenberg, *Jackson, Buchanan, and the "Corrupt Bargain" Calumny* (Pennsylvania Mag. Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Harold S. Bender, *The Founding of the Mennonite Church in America at Germantown, 1683–1708* (Mennonite Quar. Rev., Oct.); Alfred P. James, *The Significance of Western Pennsylvania in American History* (Western Pennsylvania Hist. Mag., Nov.); Arthur Cecil Bining, *The Rise of Iron Manufacture in Western Pennsylvania* (*ibid.*); W. Neil Franklin, *Pennsylvania-Virginia Rivalry for the Indian Trade of the Ohio Valley* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Vol. L., *Archives of Maryland: Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland* (Baltimore, Maryland Historical Society, 1933, pp. xxviii, 662), edited by J. Hall Pleasants, covers the years 1752–1754. If it proves nothing else, it establishes the fact that lawmaking was a confirmed habit, even before the American Revolution. It takes a fat volume to hold the record of the legislative proceedings of the little colony of Maryland during the short space of three years. There were six sessions of the legislature (four of the six in the last year of the triennium), the sittings aggregated 120 days, and the fruitage was 74 acts passed. Probably the legislation of greatest importance to the colony was the "Act for amending the Staple of Tobacco", passed in the close of 1753, so minutely regulating the whole tobacco business that it occupies sixty-three pages of text. Among the other questions that occupied the attention of the legislature during this period, as it had done in Maryland and in other colonies before, was the force of English statutes in the colonies. That other colonial problem, the disallowance of colonial statutes, likewise finds illustration in this volume. Apparently the last instances of proprietary dissent were to two bills passed in 1753.

E. C. B.

The restored Capitol of Virginia at Williamsburg was dedicated on February 24 by the Governor and members of the General Assembly, and by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., the giver of the Restoration fund. The senate assembled in the chamber of the General Court, and the delegates in the hall of the House of Burgesses. The delegates then adopted a joint resolution inviting the senate to a joint session. At this they were addressed by Governor Peery and by Mr. Rockefeller. The legislature finally passed a resolution to hold one meeting each year at the old capitol.

Duke University has issued Part III. of *A Checklist of United States Newspapers (and Weeklies before 1900) in the General Library,* compiled by Mary Wescott and Allene Ramage. It includes the items for Michigan-New York inclusive.

Although historians of the Texan revolution have long recognized the opposing habits and traditions of the Anglo-American colonists and the Mexican people as an important factor in causing conflict, the first thoroughgoing study of this subject is that of Dr. Samuel Harman Lowrie in his *Culture Conflict in Texas, 1821–1835* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, $3.00). According to Dr. Lowrie, the conflict between the political mores of the two peoples was more important than that occasioned by differences in religious and economic folkways. The influence of Mexican culture in Texas subsequent to 1835 is traced and explained in sociological

terms. The monograph is well-documented and a valuable contribution to cultural history. M. C.

Articles: William A. Russ, jr., *Disfranchisement in Maryland, 1861–1867* (Maryland Hist. Mag., Dec.); Edward L. Ryan, *Imprisonment for Debt: its Origin and Repeal* (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Joseph Clarke Robert, *Rise of the Tobacco Warehouse Auction System in Virginia, 1800–1860* (Agricultural Hist., Oct.); David Rankin Barbee, *Hinton Rowan Helper* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); L. Minerva Turnbull, *The Southern Educational Revolt* (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., Jan.); Rosser H. Taylor, *Hamburg: an Experiment in Town Promotion* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Jan.); St. Julien R. Childs, *Kitchen Physick: Medical and Surgical Care of Slaves on an Eighteenth Century Rice Plantation* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.); Florie Hutson Heyward, *America's First Steam Railroad* (South Atlantic Quar., Jan.); Susan Smythe Bennett, *The Turquands: Amplification of Sketch of Paul Turquand* (Trans. Huguenot Soc. of South Carolina, 1933); T. D. Clark, *The Montgomery and West Point Railroad* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Dec.); Cecil Johnson, *Expansion in West Florida, 1770–1779* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.); Percy Lee Rainwater, *Mississippi—Storm Center of Secession* [I., II.] (Mississippi Law Jour., Aug., Dec.); William Ransom Hogan, *Henry Austin* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Jan.); Amelia Williams, *A Critical Study of the Siege of the Alamo and of the Personnel of its Defenders* [IV.] (*ibid.*).

Documents: H. S. Parsons, ed., *Contemporary English Accounts of the Destruction of Norfolk in 1776* (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., Oct.); A. R. Newsome, ed., *Records of Emigrants from England and Scotland to North Carolina, 1774–1775* [cont'd] (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Jan.); Mabel L. Webber, ed., *The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1768–1775* (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); A. S. Salley, ed., *Letters from the Schenckingh Smiths of South Carolina to the Boylston Smiths of Massachusetts* [1714–1724] (*ibid.*); Lucia B. S. Monroe, ed., *Avondale and Deerbrook Plantation Documents,* [III., concl.] (Georgia Hist. Quar., Dec.); Anna Lewis, ed., *Fort Charles III., Arkansas: Reports for the Year 1783, by Jacobo Dubreuil, Commandant* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.).

WESTERN STATES

The *Journals of the Senate and House of the Second General Assembly of the State of Tennessee* for 1797 and 1798 form the initial publication of the Division of Library and Archives, Department of Education, State of Tennessee (Kingsport, Southern Publishers, pp. 481, iv). The work of transcription from the originals, which have suffered from the injuries of time, was

begun in 1899 by the late R. L. C. White, and has been completed by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, librarian and archivist.

No one but a "native son" could imagine how great have been the vicissitudes of the division lines within the territory and state of Indiana, as portrayed in *Indiana Boundaries: Territory, State, and County,* by George Pence and Nellie C. Armstrong, a volume of nearly nine hundred pages recently issued by the Indiana Historical Bureau. As the director of the bureau, Dr. Christopher B. Coleman, remarks in the preface, this publication has a practical aim, for the "knowledge of the limits of political units at different times is essential to the use of public records, election returns, land records, or genealogical data". The volume opens with a history of the boundary legislation carefully documented. This is followed by between three and four hundred maps, of which twenty-eight show the successive changes in the general distribution of counties within the state. After these come the maps of the individual counties, in each case a sufficient number to illustrate all the significant changes in boundary. On the pages opposite the several maps are summaries of the legislation that effected the changes. Clark County requires sixteen maps for this purpose, with Gibson and Knox trailing with thirteen. Randolph, formed in 1818, shot up in 1820 to more than twice its former length, only to be reduced a few years later to modest proportions. Knox had a still greater fall, for in the time of the Northwest Territory it had included all of present Indiana as well as parts of the four neighboring states, but it has at least the consolation of being the only one of the four Northwest Territory counties now represented on the map of the state.

The *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* for January contains an account of the Dedication Ceremonies of the restored village of New Salem, which took place on October 26. The restoration consists of thirteen log cabins identical in style and furnishings with those of Lincoln's day a century ago. The land had been given to the state by Mr. William Randolph Hearst. The work of restoration has been carried on by the authorities of the state, with the assistance of local volunteer workers.

The volume entitled *One Hundred Years of Land Values in Chicago: the Relationship of the Growth of Chicago to the Rise of its Land Values, 1830–1933* (University of Chicago Press, 1933, pp. xxxii, 519, $5.00), has the practical aim of furnishing a rational basis for a sound real estate policy, but it will be welcomed by historical students for the light it throws upon certain phases of American urban development.

Rio Grande (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1933, pp. x, 296, viii, $3.00), by Harvey Fergusson, a native son of Anglo-Saxon parentage, gives an interpretation of the factors which have produced the present state of New Mexico. The romance and glamour of the more prominent characters, who have played

rôles in the state's history, are vividly portrayed. The volume is not a detailed history but rather a series of dramatic sketches which present the high lights of the course of events. It depicts the work and contribution of the native peoples, Pueblos and Apaches, the *conquistadores* and permanent Spanish settlers, the mixed race, the Spanish Americans ("Mexicans", as the author calls them), and the various classes of Anglo-Saxons who have shared the life of the region. The book is a readable, impressionistic, and popularized history of the Rio Grande valley and is a contribution to the literature of the Southwest. R. R. H.

The Constitution of the State of Nevada, its Formation and Interpretation, by A. J. Maestretti and Charles Roger Hicks, professor of history and political science in the University of Nevada, is the subject of the University of Nevada *Bulletin* for November.

Articles: J. W. Weldon, *Early Methodism in Kentucky* (Reg. of Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Jan.); R. C. Ballard Thruston, *Filson's History and Map of Kentucky* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Jan.); Addie Lou Brooks, *Early Plans for Railroads in West Tennessee, 1830–1845* (Tennessee Hist. Mag., Oct., 1932, printed in Dec., 1933); Christopher B. Coleman, *The Lincoln Legend* (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Dec.); Marion A. Habig, *Eyewitness Accounts of La Salle's Expedition down the Mississippi River in 1682* (Mid-America, Jan.); H. R. Holand, *St. Michael, the First Mission of the West* (*ibid.*); R. Carlyle Buley, *Pioneer Health and Medical Practices in the Old Northwest prior to 1840* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.); Harold Briggs, *The Development and Decline of Open Range Ranching in the Northwest* (*ibid.*); John A. Bryan, *Outstanding Architects in St. Louis between 1804 and 1904* (Missouri Hist. Rev., Jan.); D. C. Shilling, *The Michigan Constitution of 1908: or Constitution Making since 1850* (Michigan Hist. Mag., winter); Ruth A. Gallaher, *Money in Pioneer Iowa, 1838–1865* (Iowa Jour. Hist. and Pol., Jan.); James L. Sellers, *James R. Doolittle* [I.] (Wisconsin Mag. Hist., Dec.); Joseph Schafer, *Assembling Historical Manuscripts* (*ibid.*); Stephen Leacock, *Lahontan in Minnesota* (Minnesota Hist., Dec.); Herman Roe, *The Frontier Press of Minnesota* (*ibid.*); Douglas C. McMurtrie, *The Shawnee Sun: the First Indian-Language Periodical published in the United States* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Nov.); Russell Hickman, *The Vegetarian and Octagon Settlement Companies* (*ibid.*); S. D. Mock, *Effects of the "Boom" Decade, 1870–1880, upon Colorado Population* (Colorado Mag., Jan.); Frederic A. Culmer, *Marking the Santa Fe Trail* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Jan.); A. B. Bender, *Government Explorations in the Territory of New Mexico, 1846–1859* (*ibid.*); Berlin B. Chapman, *Establishment of the Wichita Reservation* (Chron. of Oklahoma, Dec.); William E. McDonald, *The Pious Fund of the Californias* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Harvey Robbins, *Journal of Rogue River War, 1855* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Dec.); B. A. Thax-

ter, *Scientists in Early Oregon* (*ibid.*); J. Orin Oliphant, *The Library of Archibald McKinlay, Oregon Fur Trader* (Washington Hist. Quar., Jan.); Clarence L. Andrews, *Russian Shipbuilding in the American Colonies* (*ibid.*).

Documents: James Welch Patton, *The Tennessee Valley as seen by a British Traveler in 1837* [Extracts from *A Canoe Voyage up the Minnay Sotor,* by George William Featherstonehaugh] (Tennessee Hist. Mag., Oct., 1932, printed in Dec., 1933); R. P. Mason, ed., *Diary of George David: a Trip from London to Chicago in 1833* [extracts] (Michigan Hist. Mag., winter); Peter Stitz, *Kalifornische Briefe des P. Eusebio Francisco Kino nach der oberdeutschen Provinz, 1683–85* (Arch. Hist. Soc. Iesu, Jan.).

CANADA

Among the interesting essays in Volume XXIX. of the *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society are: Post-War Discontent at Niagara in 1818, by Brigadier General E. A. Cruikshank; Travel in Ontario before the Coming of the Railway, by J. J. Talman; and The First Tay Canal, by H. R. Morgan.

An important phase of the economic history of Canada is dealt with by A. R. M. Lower in an article on The Trade in Square Timber, published in vol. VI. of *Contributions to Canadian Economics* (University of Toronto Press, 1933).

Dr. John Clarence Webster, of Shediac, N. B., has reprinted a paper he presented to the Royal Society of Canada on Joseph Frederick Wallet DesBarres, the editor of the charts and views of the Atlantic coast embodied in *The Atlantic Neptune.* DesBarres worked on the surveys ten years and combined with his own plans and drawings those of other officers, and editions were published by the admiralty in 1777 and the years following. Dr. Webster has added to his original essay an account of DesBarres's subsequent career as governor of Cape Breton and of Prince Edward Island. Dr. Webster's paper on the Chignecto Dry Dock has also been reprinted from the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada, vol. XXVII. (1933).

Professor Carl Wittke in the new edition of *A History of Canada* (New York, Crofts, 1933, pp. 443), first published in 1928 (*Am. Hist. Rev.,* XXXIV. 631), has added a chapter on A New Era and its Problems. He has also somewhat expanded his chapter on Equal Status in the Empire.

An illuminating collection of documents bearing on the more recent development of the Canadian government under the North America Act, edited by Robert MacGregor Dawson, is found in *Constitutional Issues in Canada, 1900–1931* (Oxford University Press, 1933, pp. xvi, 482, 18*s.*).

Articles: J. S. Martell, *The Second Expulsion of the Acadians* (Dalhousie

Rev., Oct.); Ewen J. Macdonald, *Father Roderick Macdonell, Missionary at St. Regis and the Glengarry Catholics* (Cath. Hist. Rev., Oct.); F. W. Howay, *David Thompson's Account of his First Attempt to cross the Rockies* [June, 1801] (Queen's Quar., Aug.); Wilfred B. Kerr, *The Stamp Act in Nova Scotia* (New Eng. Quar., Sept.); Marion Gilroy, *The Partition of Nova Scotia, 1784* (Can. Hist. Rev., Dec.); Walter N. Sage, *Life at a Fur Trading Post in British Columbia a Century ago* (Washington Hist. Quar., Jan.); Hugh Mackenzie Morrison, *The Principle of Free Grants in the Land Act of 1841* (*ibid.*); Fred Landon, *Some Effects of the American Civil War on Canadian Agriculture* (Agricultural Hist., Oct.); J. A. Maxwell, *The Dispute over the Federal Dominion in Canada* (Jour. Pol. Ec., Dec.); Reginald G. Trotter, *The Canadian Back Fence in Anglo-American Relations* (Queen's Quar., Aug.); D. A. MacGibbon, *The Wheat Problem* (University of Toronto Quar., Jan.).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

The University of California Publications in Modern Philology, vol. XVI., no. 3, by Irving P. Leonard, is entitled *Romances of Chivalry in the Spanish Indies, with some "Registros" of Shipments of Books to the Spanish Colonies.*

Gaspar Pérez de Villagra's *History of New Mexico,* translated by Gilberto Espinosa with a foreword and notes by F. W. Hodge, has been published by the Quivira Society (Los Angeles, 1933).

Charles A. Thompson has published *Chile struggles for National Recovery,* Foreign Policy Report, vol. IX., no. 25 (New York, 1934).

Santiago de los Caballeros de Guatemala, by Dorothy H. Popenoe, with illustrations from drawings by the author (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1933, pp. xiv, 74, $1.50), is a posthumous work published by friends as a memorial to one who sought to appreciate the history of the strange land which had become her home. The little volume is a historical guide to Guatemala Antigua, based on the readily available printed sources. Having caught something of the spirit of the Spanish *conquistadores,* the author by her narrative and pen sketches has given a pleasing picture of the ruined city and its former inhabitants. R. R. H.

The Pan American Union has issued as No. 10 in the Bibliographic series a volume (mimeographed) entitled *Maps relating to Latin America in Books and Periodicals,* compiled by A. Curtis Wilgus, Ph.D.

No. 5 of Ibero-Americana, published by the University of California Press, is entitled *The Distribution of Aboriginal Tribes and Languages in Northwestern Mexico.*

Frank Tannenbaum has published an interpretation of recent Mexican

history entitled *Peace by Revolution,* with drawings by Miguel Covarrubias (New York, Columbia University Press, 1933).

Volume VI. of the collection of documents published by the Academy of History of Cuba contains the *Actas de las Asambleas de Representantes y del Concejo de Gobierno durante la Guerra de Independencia* [1898–1899] (Havana, 1933).

Articles: Stephen P. Duggan, *Latin America, the League, and the United States* (Foreign Affairs, Jan.); Bert L. Hunt, *The United States—Panama Claims Commission* (Am. Jour. Int. Law, Jan.); Publio A. Vásquez Hernández, *La Personalidad Internacional de Panamá* (Bol. Acad. Pan. Hist., Oct.); A. K. Jameson, *Some New Spanish Documents dealing with Drake* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Irving A. Leonard, *A Shipment of 'Comedias' to the Indies* (Hispan. Rev., Jan.); Enrique Sánchez Reyes, *La Correspondencia entre dos grandes Bibliófilos, Menéndez Pelayo y Palma* (Bol. Bib. Menéndez y Pelayo., Oct.); Lionel M. Summers, *La Clause Calvo: tendances nouvelles* (Rev. Droit Int., July); Clifford B. Casey, *The Creation and Development of the Pan American Union* (Hispan. Am. Hist. Rev., Nov.); William R. Shepherd, *Brazil as a Field for Historical Study* (*ibid.*).

Documents: Guillermo Hernández de Alba, *Cartas del Libertador* (Bol. Hist. y Antig., June); Leslie Byrd Simpson, ed., *Commission of Francisco de Ibarra for the Conquest of Nueva Viscaya* (Hispan. Am. Hist. Rev., Feb).

W. S. R.

Contributions have been made to the section of Historical News by F. M. Anderson, F. B. Artz, G. C. Boyce, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, Merle Curti, E. N. Curtis, P. G. Davidson, R. R. Hill, Albert Hyma, J. F. Jameson, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, S. R. Packard, F. L. Paxson, J. E. Pomfret, W. S. Robertson, H. R. Rudin, J. H. Stewart.